

The Public Safety National Coordination Committee
First Report to the Federal Communications Commission
August 25, 1999

Kathleen Wallman
Chair

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In 1995, the Commission, in concert with the National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA), established the Public Safety Advisory Committee (PSWAC) to provide the Commission with an assessment of the communications needs of public safety agencies through the year 2010.

In its final report submitted to the Commission in September, 1996, PSWAC stated that the spectrum then allocated to public safety was insufficient to support the current and projected needs of public safety agencies, particularly with respect to the need for spectrum on which interoperable communications could be conducted. "Interoperability" as PSWAC defined the term is:

an essential communications link within public safety and private wireless communications systems which permits units from two or more different entities to interact with one another and to exchange information according to a prescribed method in order to achieve predictable results.

In the 1997 Budget Act, Congress directed the Commission to reallocate for public safety purposes, 24 MHz of spectrum recovered from television channels 60-69 as a result of the implementation of digital television. The Commission then reallocated, for public safety use, 24 MHz of spectrum in the 700 MHz band formerly dedicated to television channels 63 and 64 and channels 68 and 69. This 24 MHz spectrum allocation was the largest ever made for public safety purposes. Approximately 10% of this new 700 MHz public safety spectrum was reserved for interoperable communications.

The Commission stated that its primary goal with respect to interoperability was seamless interoperability on a nationwide basis. It determined that the best mechanism for implementing nationwide interoperability was formation of a national committee to advise the Commission on the optimum operational and technical rules for the new interoperability spectrum. Accordingly, the Commission established the National Coordination Committee (NCC) pursuant to the Federal Advisory Committee Act and charged it with the responsibility of delivering recommendations on a variety of issues. The NCC is sponsored by the Commission, NTIA, the Federal Emergency Management Agency and the Department of Justice.

The NCC is governed by its Chair, Kathleen Wallman and guided by an 11 person Steering Committee selected to be broadly representative of the public safety community. The Steering Committee created three NCC subcommittees – the Interoperability Subcommittee, the Technology Subcommittee and the Implementation Subcommittee – each of which operates according to a detailed statement of work adopted by the Steering Committee. Each subcommittee has organized itself into several working groups which are addressing specific tasks. The work of each subcommittee is being conducted under the direction of a chair and two vice chairs. The Steering Committee and each of the subcommittees operate pursuant to a governance document that instructs the steering

committee, its subcommittees and working groups to develop their recommendations through consensus, with voting undertaken only when the consensus process fails.

The NCC has held two meetings to date, on April 29, 1999 and on June 18, 1999. At the April meeting, the NCC members were addressed by Commissioner Ness and by a number of Commission staff and others concerning the Committee's compliance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act and the Commission's *ex parte* rules, the role of the NCC sponsors, the structure of the Steering Committee and background on the NCC's predecessor, PSWAC. The June 18 meeting was preceded by a one-day meeting of the subcommittees in which the statement of work was analyzed and tasks assigned to the working groups. At the June 18 NCC general membership meeting, the NCC members were addressed by Commissioner Furchtgott-Roth. The subcommittee chairs informed the membership of the status of subcommittee work. The meeting included a presentation on digital television implementation and its implication for the activation of public safety systems in the 700 MHz spectrum. A representative of the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) explained the ANSI accreditation and standards setting process. There was also public discussion of matters being considered by the subcommittees. Additional NCC meetings are scheduled for September and December of this year and two meetings have tentatively been scheduled for January, 2000.

NCC members are cooperating in the development of recommendations using a variety of electronic communications and in-person meetings. Each of the subcommittees is operating according to milestone schedules for completion of its tasks. In February of 2000, the NCC will tender to the Commission the NCC's recommendations on interim use of the interoperability spectrum, including Federal users' access thereto, pending the development of final rules; and recommendations on whether the Commission should require trunking on all or part of the interoperability spectrum.

The document that follows, which is summarized above, constitutes the NCC's first report to the FCC. Updates to that report will be filed quarterly hereafter.

PUBLIC SAFETY NATIONAL COORDINATION COMMITTEE REPORT TO THE FCC

This report, as required by the charter of the Public Safety National Coordination Committee (NCC), informs the Commission of the progress of the NCC to date and its schedule for the future to meet the goal of providing the citizens of the United States with a seamless, interoperable communications system on the 700 MHz spectrum allocated by the Congress for public safety use. This is the first of quarterly reports that will be submitted to the Commission documenting the progress of the NCC, its steering committee, subcommittees and working groups.

Background

In 1993, Congress directed the Commission to develop a framework to ensure that public safety communications needs were met through the year 2010.¹ Pursuant to that directive, the Commission issued a report to Congress identifying a need to gather additional information on the present and future communications requirements of public safety agencies.² In 1995, the Commission, together with the National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA), established the Public Safety Wireless Advisory Committee (PSWAC), pursuant to the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA),³ to provide advice and recommendations regarding the communications needs of public safety agencies through the year 2010. Shortly thereafter, the Commission commenced a rulemaking proceeding, which sought to evaluate and plan for present and future public safety communications requirements.⁴ In the First Notice, the Commission sought comment on a wide variety of public safety communications issues, including, but not limited to, future public safety spectrum needs, projected operational and technological requirements for interoperability (between and among public safety entities on a local and regional basis), and technical parameters needed to ensure efficient and effective communications.

In September 1996, the PSWAC Final Report was submitted to the Commission as part of the record in the rule making proceeding. The PSWAC Final Report found that the spectrum then allocated to public safety was insufficient to support the current and projected voice and data needs of the public safety community, did not provide adequate capacity for obtaining interoperability, and was inadequate to meet future needs, based on projected population growth and demographic changes. The PSWAC Final Report concluded that in order to meet these needs, 2.5 MHz of spectrum should be immediately identified for interoperability purposes, and that 25 megahertz of new

¹ See 47 U.S.C. S 309(j)(10)(B)(iv), as added by the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993, Pub. L. No. 103-66, Title VI, S 6002, 107 Stat. 312 (1993).

² 1995 FCC Public Safety Report, 10 FCC Rcd 5207 (1995).

³ Federal Advisory Committee Act, 5 U.S.C., App. 2 (1988).

⁴ The Development of Operational, Technical, and Spectrum Requirements for Meeting Federal, State and Local Public Safety Agency Communication Requirements Through the Year 2010, *Notice of Proposed Rule Making*, 11 FCC Rcd 12,460 (1996) (First Notice).

public safety spectrum was needed within five years.⁵ The PSWAC Final Report further stated that data communication and wireless video needs were also expected to grow rapidly, and that up to 70 MHz of additional spectrum could be required by the year 2010 to support new capabilities and technologies, including high speed data and video.⁶

On August 14, 1996, the Commission released a Sixth Further Notice of Proposed Rule Making in the digital television (DTV) proceeding, in which it acknowledged that a portion of the spectrum recovered from TV channels 60-69 when DTV is fully deployed "could be used to meet public safety needs."⁷ In the DTV Sixth Report and Order, the Commission stated that it would initiate a separate proceeding to address the issue of how best to allocate TV channels 60-69, and would give serious consideration to allocating 24 megahertz of that spectrum for public safety use.⁸ Subsequently, in the 1997 Budget Act, Congress directed the Commission to reallocate 24 megahertz of the spectrum recovered from TV channels 60-69 as a result of DTV implementation for public safety services.⁹ Shortly thereafter, the Commission initiated a rulemaking proceeding in ET Docket No. 97-157 which led to the adoption of a Report and Order reallocating 24 megahertz of spectrum located in the 700 MHz band for public safety services.¹⁰ This new allocation was the largest ever made for public safety communications and constitutes a significant public benefit derived from the conversion of television broadcasting in the United States from analog technology to state-of-the-art digital technology.¹¹

In the *Second Notice*, the Commission proposed to dedicate a significant amount of 700 MHz spectrum solely for interoperability communications. It stated that the precise amount of spectrum devoted to interoperability would reflect the record of public

⁵ PSWAC Final Report at 3.

⁶ *Id.* at 19,20

⁷ Advanced Television Systems and Their Impact Upon the Existing Television Broadcast Service, MM Docket No. 87-268, *Sixth Further Notice of Proposed Rule Making*, 11 FCC Rcd 10,968, 10,980 (1996) (DTV Sixth Notice).

⁸ Advanced Television Systems and Their Impact Upon the Existing Television Broadcast Service, MM Docket No. 87-268, *Sixth Report and Order*, 12 FCC Rcd 14,588, 14,626 (1997) (DTV Sixth Report & Order).

⁹ 1997 Budget Act, codified at 47 U.S.C. § 337.

¹⁰ Reallocation of Television Channels 60-69, the 746-806 MHz Band, ET Docket No. 97-157, *Notice of Proposed Rule Making*, 12 FCC Rcd 14,141 (1997); *Reallocation Report and Order*, 12 FCC Rcd 22,953 (1998).

¹¹ See DTV Sixth Report and Order, 12 FCC Rcd at 14,588.

safety user expertise, particularly with respect to the channelization required to maintain optimum functionality.¹² The public safety community, in responding to the *Second Notice* voiced nearly unanimous approval for the concept of reserving spectrum for interoperability purposes. The Commission therefore allocated approximately ten percent of the 700 MHz spectrum for interoperability purposes.¹³ It defined interoperability as follows:

An essential communications link within public safety and private wireless communications systems which permits units from two or more different entities to interact with one another and to exchange information according to a prescribed method in order to achieve predictable results.¹⁴

Additionally, the Commission stated that its primary goal with respect to interoperability was seamless interoperability on a nationwide basis.¹⁵ It also determined that formation of a national committee to advise the Commission on the optimum use of the interoperability spectrum was the best mechanism for implementing nationwide seamless interoperability. It therefore decided to charter the Public Safety National Coordination Committee (NCC) pursuant to the Federal Advisory Committee Act¹⁶ and assigned it the following major responsibilities:

1. Formulate and submit for Commission review and approval an operational plan to achieve national interoperability that includes a shared or priority system among users of the interoperability spectrum for both day-to-day and emergency operations and, in this connection, recommendations regarding Federal users' access to the interoperability spectrum.
2. Recommend an interoperability digital modulation standard to the Commission, consider the benefits of employing trunking and make a timely recommendation as to whether the Commission should require trunking on all or a portion of the nationwide interoperability spectrum, and recommend the scope of parameters (e.g., sensitivity, selectivity, dynamic range, durability characteristics) that need to be included in receiver standards.

¹² See *Second Notice*, 12 FCC Rcd at 17,739.

¹³ The Development of Operational, Technical, and Spectrum Requirements for Meeting Federal, State and Local Public Safety Agency Communication Requirements Through the Year 2010, Establishment of Rules and Requirements for Priority Access Service, WT Docket No. 96-86, *First Report and Order and Third Notice of Proposed Rulemaking*, FCC 98-191 (September 29, 1998) at ¶ 73. (First Report and Order).

¹⁴ *Id.* at ¶ 76.

¹⁵ *Id.* at ¶ 90.

¹⁶ 5 U.S.C. App. 2.

3. Offer voluntary assistance in the development of coordinated regional plans.
4. Provide recommendations on other technical matters that are common to the public safety community generally.¹⁷

Formation of the NCC

In accord with the charge contained in the *First Report and Order* the NCC was chartered by the Commission pursuant to FACA. The NCC charter incorporates the charge, above, given by the Commission.¹⁸ The NCC is required to carry out its purposes by September 28, 2002, unless the NCC's term is extended by the Commission. The charter provides that the Commission will provide certain staff support to the NCC, that members of the NCC not employed by the Federal government will serve without compensation; but that per diem subsistence or reimbursement may be available to NCC participants in the proper case. The estimated operating cost of the NCC is \$48,600 annually. The NCC must meet at least twice each year and the NCC is authorized to carry out its work through subcommittees, working groups or task forces. The charter also authorizes use of such electronic means as facsimile and teleconferencing. In order to obtain a broad range of representation, the charter required that membership in the NCC should be solicited from local, state and federal public safety agencies, including those individuals responsible for emergency responsiveness, planning, resource management and policy development. Membership also was to be solicited from manufacturing, technology, public policy, network reliability and design and service provider communities. The NCC charter was filed with the General Services Administration, as required by FACA,¹⁹ on February 25, 1999; the committee is set to expire on September 8, 2002 unless extended by the Commission.²⁰

The Commission also specified that the NCC or a working group thereunder be accredited by the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) to develop all technical standards.²¹ Subsequently, in response to petitions for reconsideration of the *First Report and Order*, submitted *inter alia* by ANSI, the Commission deleted the requirement for ANSI accreditation and suggested that the NCC set technical standards in conjunction with Accredited Standards Developers who already have undergone the

¹⁷ See *First Report and Order* at ¶¶ 92, 116, 121.

¹⁸ See NCC Charter, Appendix A hereto, at ¶¶ B(1)-(6).

¹⁹ *Id.* at § 9(c).

²⁰ *Id.*

²¹ *Id.*

relatively lengthy ANSI accreditation process.²² Finally, the Commission emphasized that the NCC was to be composed of a broad range of representatives of the public safety user community.²³ Thus, the NCC was established with an "open membership" policy, the better to serve FACA's goals of openness and balance.²⁴

Consistent with the *First Report and Order's* recognition that Federal agencies should be provided access to the use of interoperable spectrum, the Commission obtained the participation of the Department of Justice (DOJ), the National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA), the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and the Department of the Treasury as co-sponsors, with the FCC, of the activities of the NCC.

On January 28, 1999, the Chairman of the Commission appointed Kathleen Wallman to be chair of the NCC. Her first act as chair was to establish a steering committee for the NCC to be the primary policy body governing the NCC's affairs. To insure wide and balanced participation, steering committee members were selected to be representative of the public safety community, government and industry. The current members of the steering committee are:

Mayor Clarence Harmon	U.S. Conference of Mayors
Julio ("Rick") Murphy	Federal Law Enforcement Wireless Users Group
Marilyn Ward	National Public Safety Telecommunications Council
Steven Proctor	Public Safety Wireless Network
Ernest Hofmeister	Ericsson Private Radio Systems
Harlin R. McEwen	International Association of Chiefs of Police
Douglas M. Aiken	International Association of Fire Chiefs
Ellen O'Hara	Motorola, Inc.

²² The Development of Operational, Technical, and Spectrum Requirements for Meeting Federal, State and Local Public Safety Agency Communication Requirements Through the Year 2010, WT Docket No. 96-86, *Memorandum Opinion and Order on Reconsideration*, FCC 99-85 (May 4, 1999).

²³ *First Report and Order* at ¶ 94.

²⁴ See 5 U.S.C. App. 2 § 5(b)(2).

Louise Renne, Esq.	Local and State Government Advisory Committee
Governor James B. Hunt, Jr.	National Governors Association
Timothy Loewenstein	National Association of Counties

The Steering Committee has been active in setting NCC policy, developing and adopting governance rules for the NCC²⁵ providing direction to the subcommittees, developing subcommittees' Statement of Work,²⁶ and setting the content and agendas of meetings.

In March of 1999, Michael Wilhelm, a senior staff attorney at the Commission was appointed Designated Federal Officer (DFO) for the NCC, pursuant to FACA,²⁷ to insure compliance with the statute, to serve at each NCC meeting, to assume certain administrative duties and to serve as liaison between the Commission and the NCC.

The NCC held its first meeting – an organizational meeting – on April 29, 1999.²⁸ The Committee received remarks from FCC Commissioner Susan Ness, NCC Chair Kathleen Wallman, FCC Wireless Telecommunications Bureau Chief, Thomas Sugrue, William Hatch of NTIA, James Downes of the Department of Treasury, James Turk of FEMA and Ivan Fong of DOJ. A videotape presentation prepared by DOJ illustrated the critical problems presented by lack of interoperability in public safety communications systems. Ms. Wallman announced the members of the NCC steering committee and explained the committee's function to the membership. Ms. Paula Silberthau of the Commission's General Counsel's Office briefed the membership on the NCC's required compliance with FACA. David Senzel of the General Counsel's office explained the applicability of the Commission's *ex parte* rules to the proceedings of the NCC. D'wana Terry, Chief of the Public Safety and Private Wireless Division of the Wireless Telecommunications Bureau offered an overview of current public safety issues. Philip Verveer explained the workings of the NCC's predecessor Federal Advisory Committee, PSWAC. Steering Committee member Harlin R. McEwen discussed public safety from a law enforcement perspective. A period for public participation was provided and several NCC members and members of the general public suggested issues that should be addressed by the NCC. Ms. Wallman explained that much of the work of the NCC would be accomplished by three subcommittees. The first subcommittee – the interoperability subcommittee – was to be concerned with interoperability issues, generally; the second subcommittee – the technology subcommittee – was to be responsible for developing recommended standards for

²⁵ See Appendix D.

²⁶ See Appendix E.

²⁷ See 5 U.S.C. App. 2 § 10(e).

²⁸ The agenda of the first meeting is included herewith as Appendix B.

interoperable 700 MHz radio equipment; the third subcommittee – the implementation subcommittee – was charged with developing a plan for deployment of interoperable radio equipment nationwide. Ms. Wallman explained the workings of the three NCC subcommittees and announced that expressions of interest in participating in the subcommittees should be submitted to the DFO by May 10, 1999.²⁹

In the weeks following the first meeting of the NCC, multiple expressions of interest in subcommittee participation were received. Ms. Wallman, the DFO and other representatives of the FCC consulted frequently with the NCC steering committee using multi-party telephone conferencing facilities. These conference calls allowed the steering committee to provide its advice and consent to Ms. Wallman's selections of leadership positions – chairs and vice chairs – of the three NCC subcommittees. They also provided a mechanism for the discussion of the terms and conditions of the documents that would govern the decision-making processes of the NCC and of a statement of work to be issued to the three subcommittees. The governance document requires the steering committee and its subcommittees and working groups to develop their recommendations through consensus, with voting undertaken only as a last resort when the consensus process fails.³⁰ The statement of work is a concise statement of the steps necessary to satisfy the charge given to the NCC by the Commission.³¹

The leadership positions established for the subcommittees are as follows:

Interoperability Subcommittee	
Sgt. John Powell	Chair
Kyle Sinclair	First Vice Chair
Steven Souder	Second Vice Chair
Technology Subcommittee	
Glen Nash	Chair
Donald Ashley	First Vice Chair
Steven Jennings	Second Vice Chair
Implementation Subcommittee	
Lt. Edward Dempsey	Chair
(Vacant)	First Vice Chair
Richard DeMello	Second Vice Chair

²⁹ The activities of the April 29 NCC meeting are fully reported in the meeting minutes, Appendix C hereto.

³⁰ The governance document, Public Safety National Coordination Committee Rules and Procedures, is included herewith as Appendix D.

³¹ The statement of work, Public Safety National Coordination Committee (NCC) Subcommittee Statement of Work, is included herewith as Appendix E.

The NCC met for the second time on June 18, 1999.³² The meeting of the general membership was preceded, on June 17, by the first meeting of the NCC subcommittees. The subcommittees discussed the statement of work in detail, assigned specific working groups to address each component thereof and established benchmark timetables for completion of the tasks defined in the statement of work.

The NCC working groups for its three subcommittees are as follows:

INTEROPERABILITY SUBCOMMITTEE WORKING GROUPS

	1 Report Drafting	2 Operational	3 Rules & Policy Spectrum Planning	4 Liaison with outside groups	5 Trunking
Name					
Blackmore, Kay				X	
Buchanan, David					C
Chirhart, Tom		X	X	X	
Descoteaux, Celeste			X		
Desourdis, Bob	X				
Eierman, David					X
Fitzsimon, Leo		X	X		X
Gallelli, Joe	X			X	X
Haraseth, Ron		X	X		X
Harpring, Jim		X		X	
Ittner, Al	X	X			
Jennings, Steve				X	X
Lineberry, Gill		X	X		
Mayworm, Ron		X			X
McDole, Art	X	X	X	X	
Miller, Larry		X	X		X
Orsulak, Rich			X		
Pfohl, Don		X		C	
Rinehart, Bette			X		
Schlieman, Robert	C	X	X		X
Shahnami, Ali			X	X	X
Sinclair, Kyle		C			
Smith, Brenna			X		
Speidel, Bob	X		X		X
Tolman, Tom	X	X	X	X	X
Watts, Joe		X	X		
Wells, Carlton		X	C		X

(Note: Workgroup chairs are designated by "c", and chairs' names are in boldface type)

³² The agenda of the second meeting is included herewith as Appendix F.

TECHNOLOGY SUBCOMMITTEE WORKING GROUPS

	1 Non-Voice Standards	2 Voice Standards	3 Spectrum Utilization	4 Receiver Standards	5 Competition Among Manufacturers	6 Report Drafting
Name						
Ashley, Don						C
Buchanan, David	C	X		X		
Chapman, Doug		X	X		X	
Coltri, Norm		X	X			
Descoteaux, Celeste	X	X		X		
Dracella, Ed			X	X		
Eierman, David	X	X	X	X		
Fenichel, Robert		X			X	
Fitzsimon, Leo		X			X	X
Gallelli, Joe	X	X	X		X	X
Haakinson, Eldon	X	X		X		
Haraseth, Ron			C			
Harpring, Jim		X				
Ittner, Al					X	
Jennings, Steve					C	
Lineberry, Gill			X			
Maguire, Tim		X	X			
May, Paul		X	X	X	X	X
Mayworm, Ron		X				
McDole, Art		X	X			X
Mickelsen, Scott		X	X			
Miller, Larry		X	X			
Pfohl, Don				C		
Powell, John	X	X				
Rinehart, Bette						X
Schlieman, Robert	X	C	X	X		
Smith, Brenna	X	X		X		
Tolman, Tom	X	X	X	X	X	X
Trahos, Dr. Michael			X			
Watts, Joe		X			X	
Wells, Carlton			X	X		

(Note: Workgroup chairs are designated by "c", and chairs' names are in boldface type)

IMPLEMENTATION SUBCOMMITTEE WORKING GROUPS

	1 Report Drafting	2 DTV Transition	3 Policy – Regional Planning Committees	4 Technology Policy	5 Inter Sub- Committee Coordination
Name					
Blackmore, Kay			X		
Breneiser, Craig	X				
Buchanan, David		X	X		

Coltri, Norm		X	X	X	
Dempsey, Edward	C				C
Eierman, David		C			X
Fitzsimon, Leo			X	X	
Gallelli, Joe				X	
Gillory, Ron		X	X	X	
Griffin, Frederick	X		C	X	X
Haraseth, Ron			X		
Ittner, Al	X			X	
Jennings, Steve		X			
Kane, Carl		X			
Lineberry, Gill			X	X	
McDole, Art		X	X	X	
Miller, Tom		X			
Miller, Larry			X	X	
Pfohl, Don		X			
Powell, John		X	X	X	
Rinehart, Bette	X		X	X	
Schlieman, Robert	X	X	X	X	
Shahnam, Ali		X	X	C	X
Trahos, Dr. Michael			X		
Wain, Jim			X		
Wells, Carlton			X	X	

(Note: Workgroup chairs are designated by "c", and chairs' names are in boldface type)

The subcommittee meetings were followed by the June 18 meeting of the general membership. At that meeting, the NCC members were addressed by Commissioner Furchtgott-Roth on the responsibilities the Commission has placed on the NCC. The chairs of each subcommittee presented oral reports on the status of subcommittee work. Bruce Franca of the Commission's Office of Engineering and Technology gave a presentation detailing the effect of existing digital and analog television allocations that have a co-channel or adjacent channel relationship to frequencies in the 700 MHz band that will be used for public safety communications. He also discussed the transition from analog to digital operation in the television bands and the factors that would affect the timing of that transition. Steven Proctor of the State of Utah Communications Division gave a presentation on the implementation of a statewide 800 MHz trunked radio system and explained the technical and economic factors that affecting the design and implementation of such a system. A presentation on the accreditation process used by the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) was given by ANSI's Jane Schweiker who discussed in detail the manner in which standards are formulated and the effect of uniform standards on domestic and international industries. The June 18 meeting also provided a public forum for discussion of matters being considered by the subcommittees and the Steering Committee.

NCC members are cooperating in the development of recommendations to the Commission using a variety of communications means, including e-mail, list servers for each subcommittee and working group, telephone conference calls and ad hoc, in person meetings. Thus, for example, some members of the Interoperability,

Technology and Implementation Subcommittees convened during the August 9-12, 1999, conference of the Association of Public Safety Officials, International, in Minneapolis, Minnesota. Although not a formal meeting, and non-decisional in nature, this provided a valuable forum for those present to exchange ideas in advance of the next subcommittee meetings.

The next meeting of the NCC is set for September 24, 1999 in Lansing, Michigan. The meeting will be held immediately after a symposium sponsored by the Public Safety Wireless Network in order to permit NCC members to attend both events. The meeting of the full NCC membership will be preceded by meetings of the three subcommittees and their working groups on September 23. The subcommittee chairs will report the status of the subcommittees' work to the full NCC membership and the Steering Committee at the September 24 general membership meeting. The following meeting of the NCC will be held in New York City on November 19, 1999, preceded by meetings of the three subcommittees and their working groups on November 18.

The NCC charter requires the NCC to submit quarterly reports to the Commission and states that "(t)he first progress report must include the NCC's plan of action and milestones for the development of each of its recommendations on standards within the four year time frame . . .³³ In response to the charter's requirement that an action plan and milestones be specified, the three NCC subcommittees have developed, and the Chair and Steering Committee have approved, the following work products and milestone schedules for completion of their assigned tasks:

INTEROPERABILITY SUBCOMMITTEE
MILESTONES AND PLAN OF ACTION

Aug 2-22, 1999	Interoperability Subcommittee Working Group 5 (addressing Trunking of Interoperability Channels) confers by listserv, e-mail, telephone and conference call about trunking recommendation.
Aug 6, 1999	Interoperability Subcommittee chair provide NCC staff with report on subcommittee progress to date, referencing report to Statement of Work, and plan of action and milestones through September 28, 2002.
Aug 8-12, 1999	Subcommittee Working Groups confer on an ad-hoc basis at APCO conference in Minneapolis.
Aug 16, 1999	NCC staff submits initial draft of progress report to Steering Committee.
Aug 20, 1999	Steering Committee gives comments on progress report to NCC staff.
Aug 25, 1999	NCC submits progress report to FCC.
Sept 23, 1999	Lansing Interoperability Subcommittee meeting. The primary

³³ See Part B of the NCC Charter, the entirety of which is included as Appendix G.

	discussion will focus on trunking.
Sept 24, 1999	Continuation of Lansing Interoperability Subcommittee meetings. Subcommittee arrives at preliminary recommendations on trunking. Initial report from Working Group 1 on structure of final Interoperability Subcommittee report presented.
Sept 24, 1999	(Afternoon) NCC Meeting. Subcommittee reports on preliminary recommendations on trunking and interim use. Questions and comments by Steering Committee, audience.
Sept 24-Oct 19, 1999	Working Groups continue to work by listserv, e-mail, telephone and conference call concerning recommendations on trunking. Initial reports from Working Group 2 (Operational) and Working Group 3 (Rules & Policies, Spectrum Planning) begin formulation. Information needs from all Working Groups forwarded to Working Group 4 (Information/Liaison).
Oct 18, 1999	Reports due from individual Interoperability Working Group chairs of work in progress and any interim recommendations
Oct 20, 1999	Subcommittee conference call with members of Working Group 5 to discuss resolution of any pending issues on trunking. Working group chair informs members/leadership of the substance of the working groups' recommendations.
Oct 22, 1999	Subcommittee chairs hold conference call with Steering Committee to discuss resolution of any pending issues on trunking and interim use and to inform Steering Committee of the substance of subcommittees' proposed recommendations. At conclusion of conference call, Interoperability Working Group 1 (Report Drafting) given direction to those responsible for drafting the reports and writing of draft recommendations commences.
Oct 20-Nov 10, 1999	Working Groups continue to work by listserv, e-mail, telephone and conference call concerning writing of draft recommendations for trunking (WORKING GROUP-1) and general work for other Working Groups.
Nov 12, 1999	Working Groups 1 submits to Interoperability Subcommittee chair its final draft of recommendations concerning trunking for distribution to Subcommittee and Steering Committee.

Nov 18, 1999	Subcommittee meeting, NYC. Subcommittee discusses final draft from Working Group 1, reconciles differences and agrees on content of final draft representing the consensus of the Subcommittee. Preliminary reports from Working Groups 2 and 3 presented; direction given to Working Group 4 regarding additional information needs. Subcommittee prepares written report of progress since submission of last progress report to FCC on August 25 and furnish report to Steering Committee.
Nov 19, 1999	NCC general membership meeting, NYC. Subcommittee reports on proposed content of consensus final draft. Steering committee resolves any outstanding issues and directs individuals responsible for drafting to prepare final report to FCC on trunking recommendations. Steering Committee discusses content of progress report prepared by Subcommittee and gives Subcommittee direction on the content of the final version of the progress report.
Nov 23, 1999	Subcommittee submits final draft of progress report to Steering Committee which provides comments.
Nov 24, 1999	Steering Committee advises Subcommittee of any needed changes to progress report.
Nov 26, 1999	<u>NCC submits progress report to FCC</u>
Dec. 10, 1999	Subcommittee submits to Steering Committee final draft of recommendations concerning trunking.
Jan, 2000 Meeting	Subcommittees meet. Interim reports from Working Groups 2, 3 and 4 presented. Agenda to be determined.
Jan, 2000	NCC general meeting. Discussion of final draft concerning trunking.
Feb 1, 2000	Subcommittee furnishes Steering Committee with final draft of recommendations concerning trunking, incorporating any changes required by Steering Committee in response to draft submitted on December 10, 1999.
Feb 25, 2000	NCC submits to FCC, written reports containing recommendation on trunking and recommendations on interim use of interoperability spectrum.

TECHNOLOGY SUBCOMMITTEE
PLAN OF ACTION AND MILESTONES

Aug 8-12, 1999	Subcommittee working groups confer on an ad-hoc basis during APCO Annual Conference in Minneapolis, MN
Aug 16, 1999	Subcommittee Chair submits Progress Report for inclusion in report to FCC

Aug 16-Sep 23, 1999	<p>WORKING GROUP1 to discuss via listserv and email what information they need regarding types of non-voice services for which standards may be needed.</p> <p>Working Group 2 conduct discussion via listserv and email regarding criteria for use in selecting voice-message standard.</p> <p>Working Group3 to begin discussions via listserv and email regarding distribution of interoperability channels within bandplan</p> <p>Working Group 4 to begin discussions via listserv and email regarding receiver standards for narrowband (6.25/12.5 kHz) channels</p>
Sep 23, 1999	<p>Technology Subcommittee Meeting in Lansing, MI.</p> <p>Report from Working Group2 on recommended criteria for selecting a voice-message standard. Resolve any differences and finalize criteria.</p> <p>Report from Working Group 1, Working Group 3 and Working Group 4 on progress.</p> <p>Forward request for information regarding non-voice service requirements to Interoperability Subcommittee.</p>
Sep 24, 1999	<p>NCC Meeting</p> <p>Presentation of criteria for selecting voice message standard. Questions and comments from Steering Committee. Steering Committee evaluation of criteria.</p>
Sep 24-Oct 22, 1999	<p>Working Groups continue discussions via listserv, email, and conference call</p>
Oct 25, 1999	<p>Reports from Working Group chairpersons to Chair of Subcommittee on progress and interim recommendations.</p>
Nov 12, 1999	<p>Working Group 2 submits to Subcommittee Chair draft recommendation of voice-message standard. Chair forwards draft to full Subcommittee and Steering Committee for review.</p>
Nov 18, 1999	<p>Subcommittee meeting in New York City.</p> <p>Working Group 2 presents report on voice-message standard. Committee discusses recommendations, reconciles differences and agrees on content of final draft representing consensus of the Subcommittee.</p> <p>Working Group 3 presents report on bandplan. Committee discusses recommendations, reconciles differences and agrees on content of final draft representing consensus of the Subcommittee.</p> <p>Working Group 4 presents report on recommendation of scope of parameters for receiver standards.</p> <p>Solicit proposals for wide-band (50/150 kHz) channel standards.</p> <p>Receive input from Interoperability Subcommittee on non-voice requirements.</p>

Nov 19, 1999	<p>NCC Meeting</p> <p>Subcommittee reports on proposed content of report recommending selection of voice-message standard. Steering Committee resolves any outstanding issues and gives Subcommittee direction for preparation of final report.</p> <p>Subcommittee reports on any proposed changes to the bandplan. Steering Committee resolves any outstanding issues and gives Subcommittee direction for preparation of final report.</p>
Nov 22-Dec 10, 1999	<p>Working Group 6 in conjunction with Working Group 2 prepares draft report on recommendation regarding voice-message standard.</p> <p>Working Group 6 in conjunction with Working Group 3 prepares draft report on recommendation regarding bandplan.</p>
Nov 22-Dec 31, 1999	<p>Working Group 1 begins discussions on standards for non-voice services.</p> <p>Working Group 4 continued work using listserv and email in furtherance of recommendation on scope of receiver standards/</p>
Dec 13, 1999	Draft reports on voice-message standards and bandplan distributed to full Subcommittee and to Steering Committee for review and comment
Dec 17, 1999	Comments due on draft reports
Dec 31, 1999	<p>Final Draft of reports on voice-message standard and bandplan distributed to full Subcommittee and to Steering Committee</p> <p>Working Group 4 submits preliminary proposals for receiver standards for distribution to full Subcommittee</p>
Jan 2000	<p>Subcommittee meeting (location to be determined).</p> <p>Discussion of proposed receiver standards. Reconcile any differences and agree on content of final draft of report representing consensus of the Subcommittee.</p> <p>Discussions on non-voice standards.</p> <p>Hear proposals from manufacturers on wideband (50/150 kHz) technologies.</p>
Jan 2000	<p>NCC Meeting</p> <p>Adoption of final report for voice-message standards</p> <p>Adoption of recommendations regarding bandplan</p> <p>Report from Subcommittee on content of report recommending receiver standards. Steering Committee resolves any outstanding issues and gives Subcommittee direction for preparation of report on recommendation of receiver standards.</p>
Feb 18, 2000	Working Group 6 in conjunction with Working Group 4 prepares draft report on receiver standards. Report forwarded to full Subcommittee and to Steering Committee for review and comment.
Feb 25, 2000	Comments Due
Mar 3, 2000	Final Draft prepared and distributed

(Date to be determined)	NCC Meeting Recommend scope of parameters for receiver standards for narrowband channels
-------------------------	---

IMPLEMENTATION SUBCOMMITTEE
MILESTONES AND PLAN OF ACTION

Aug 2-22, 1999	Subcommittees and working groups confer by listserv, e-mail, telephone and conference call regarding existing documents such as the Public Safety Wireless Network report on National Public Safety Planning Advisory Committee regional plans, FCC and other documents regarding DTV plans, FCC rules, and requirements and defining opportunities for Public Safety implementation and deployment of 700 MHz systems. Defining technical standards where advisable and determining Public Safety use of 700 MHz based on present availability, future plans shall be based upon need as seen today and probability of implementation based on probable plans. Formulate discussions/decisions/presentation at the September meetings. Define tasks and accomplishment deadlines and relationship of tasks to other subcommittee progress.
Aug 6, 1999	Subcommittee provides NCC staff with a report on subcommittee progress to date. Various milestones identified and direction determined.
Aug 8-12, 1999	Meet with subcommittee/working group individuals at the APCO Conference to further the process.
Sept 13, 1999	Working group chairs to submit proposed plans for discussion points/presentations/agendas for subcommittee meeting on September 23, 1999.
Sept 23-24, 1999	Lansing subcommittee meeting.
Sept 24, 1999	Subcommittee delivers a report to NCC regarding preliminary recommendations on plan requirements, direction and DTV channel plan for Public Safety use and respond to audience and other committee questions.
Sept 24 – Oct 19, 1999	Subcommittee and working groups to continue work via listserv, e-mail, telephone and conference call to define and resolve issues in the planning process. Review other subcommittee progress and tasks to determine a relative time line for accomplishments within the implementation committee.
Oct 20, 1999	Report due from working group chairs to inform subcommittee chairs of work in progress and recommendations from the work groups.
Oct 22, 1999	Conference call between Steering Committee and subcommittees regarding proposed recommendations and directions as needed from the NCC regarding the drafting of reports.
Nov 8, 1999 ⁴ 9	Working groups to submit final written information regarding the discussions and decision to the subcommittee chairs regarding items to be discussed at the November 18, 1999 subcommittee meetings in New York City.

Nov 18, 1999	Subcommittee meetings in New York City to discuss and reconcile issues within the work groups/subcommittees and among the other subcommittees that make up the subcommittee structure. Subcommittees to provide a progress report for submission to the FCC based upon happening sense the earlier reports submitted on August 25, 1999.
Nov 19, 1999	NYC – subcommittee reports shall be presented to the NCC and those in attendance for consideration and discussion.
Nov 23, 1999	The implementation subcommittee to submit final draft report on process to the NCC Steering Committee.
Nov 24, 1999	Communications with NCC Steering Committee regarding changes they recommend to the final draft report provided to them on the 23 rd .
Dec 10, 1999	Implementation subcommittee to submit to the Steering Subcommittee final draft recommendations on items that have been deemed accomplishable within this time frame determined at earlier meetings and at this meeting, regarding regional planning requirements and DTV implementation plan.
Jan 20-21, 2000	Subcommittee and NCC meetings to take place to continue discussion of issues that need to be resolved and incorporated in the final draft regarding issues that can be completed in this time frame to be completed by deadline for planned input to the FCC.
Feb 1, 2000	Subcommittee to complete and furnish to the Steering Committee final draft recommendations on regional planning requirements and DTV implementation plan.

In addition to the above described tasks, the subcommittees will provide policy and other advice to Regional Planning Committees when so requested by any such committee.

As noted above³⁴ the Commission has freed the NCC from the need to become ANSI accredited. Because ANSI accreditation is a lengthy process, the relief provided by the Commission is enabling the NCC to concentrate its efforts on developing timely recommendations to the Commission. However, in developing recommended standards, the NCC is employing an open process governed by ANSI standards or standards approved by ANSI and will assure ensure insure that NCC technical standards recommendations are adequately supported with standards developed by one or more ANSI accredited standards developers.

In developing recommended standards, the NCC is not proceeding *ab initio*. There is a substantial body of existing work related to interoperability, trunking and other issues being addressed by the NCC and there is a reservoir of knowledge and experience with these issues in the NCC membership and in the membership of allied organizations such as ANSI committee members. Accordingly, the NCC is grounding its recommendations on this prior work, modified, as necessary, to meet particular requirements for interoperable operation in the 700 MHz band.

³⁴ See page 5.

In connection with the charter's requirement that the NCC report on the "progress toward the development of recommendations for technical and equipment standards," the Commission is referred to the discussions, above, of the work of the NCC subcommittees and their working groups.

This concludes the NCC's first report to the Commission as required by the NCC's charter. An update to this report will be filed October 25, 1999 and every three months thereafter.

Respectfully submitted,

Kathleen Wallman
Chair, Public Safety
National Coordination Committee

Appendix A

CHARTER

THE PUBLIC SAFETY NATIONAL COORDINATION COMMITTEE

A. Official Designation

The official designation of the advisory committee will be the "Public Safety National Coordination Committee" (National Coordination Committee or NCC).

The establishment of the NCC is pursuant to the action adopted by the Federal Communications Commission ("Commission") on August 6, 1998, and released on September 29, 1998. See The Development of Operational, Technical and Spectrum Requirements For Meeting Federal, State and Local Public Safety Agency Communication Requirements Through the Year 2010 and Establishment of Rules and Requirements For Priority Access Service, WT Docket No. 96-86, First Report and Order and Third Notice of Proposed Rule Making, FCC 98-191 (1998) ("First Report and Order").

The NCC will function as an advisory body according to procedures set forth in the Federal Advisory Committee Act, 5 U.S.C., App 2.

B. NCC Objectives and Scope of its Activity

In the First Report and Order, the Commission allocated spectrum in the 700 MHz band for public safety communications in an effort to meet the Nation's critical need for state-of-the-art communications systems and reliable interoperability between local, state and federal public safety authorities. The First Report and Order sought to provide a regulatory framework to (1) enable development of a national interoperability plan, (2) encourage intensive and efficient use of the frequencies 764-776/794-806 MHz (the 700 MHz band), (3) accommodate new and as yet unanticipated developments in technology and equipment; and (4) provide spectrum management and planning mechanisms necessary to develop multiple user public safety communications systems and local and regional interoperability systems that effectively incorporate all public safety services providers.

In accordance with the First Report and Order, the National Coordination Committee's major responsibilities will be to:

- 1) formulate and submit for Commission review and approval an operational plan to achieve national interoperability that includes a shared or priority system among users of the interoperability spectrum (i.e., spectrum in the 700 MHz band specifically designated for interoperability use as well as spectrum in other frequency bands so designated) for both day-to-day and emergency operations and, in this connection, recommendations regarding Federal Government users' access to the interoperability spectrum;

2) to recommend, no later than September 28, 2002, technical standards to achieve full interoperability and network integration, including digital modulation, trunking, and receiver standards, network redundancy/reliability and whatever other technical capabilities are found necessary to provide local, state and federal governments with an interoperable network to meet public safety needs into the next century. All technical standards recommendations are to be developed under the standard setting processes so accredited by the American National Standards Institute ("ANSI"). The NCC, or its designated subcommittee or working group, may incorporate proprietary data into such standards in accordance with ANSI procedures.

In developing its recommendations of voluntary technical standards for achieving interoperability, the NCC is required to monitor industry standard-setting activities, including those noted in paragraph 113 of the First Report and Order, and use the information learned in formulating its recommendation.

All NCC recommendations are advisory only and must be submitted to the Commission for review and approval. Because the NCC's recommendation will be developed through an ANSI-certified process, the Commission will not unnecessarily disturb technical standards recommended through this open and neutral process;

3) recommend to the Commission as soon as practicable, but in any event no later than one year of the date of filing this charter, whether the Commission should take action to require trunking on all or a portion of the nationwide interoperability spectrum is needed;

4) within one year of the date of filing this charter, formulate and submit for Commission review and approval a set of recommendations for the use of interoperability spectrum, including recommendations for Federal Government users' access, that will allow public safety licensees to make use of such spectrum until final rules are developed;

5) provide policy recommendations on an advisory basis to the regional planning committees in order to ensure the development of coordinated regional plans; and

6) provide recommendations on other technology, telecommunications and public policy matters that relate to the expedited planning and deployment of a nationwide interoperable and reliable public safety and emergency responsiveness network.

C. Period of Time Necessary for the NCC to Carry Out its Purposes

The NCC is expected to complete its work by September 28, 2002 unless the term of the Committee is expressly extended beyond that time by the Commission. The NCC will submit to the Commission quarterly reports on its progress toward the development of recommendations for technical and equipment standards and its other responsibilities within the scope set forth in Part B above. The first progress report must include the NCC's plan of

action and milestones for the development of each of its recommendations on standards within the four-year time frame, and will be due to the Commission within six months of the filing of this Charter. Subsequent updates will be due to the Commission every three months thereafter during the term of the NCC. All such reports will be routinely available for public inspection and duplicating unless the Commission, or the Chief of the Wireless Telecommunications Bureau acting on delegated authority, adopts an order to the contrary.

D. Official to Whom the NCC Reports

Chairman, Federal Communications Commission.

E. Agency Responsible for Providing Necessary Support to the NCC

The Federal Communications Commission will provide the necessary staff support for the NCC, including arranging the facilities needed for the conduct of the meetings of the NCC. Members of the NCC not employed by the Federal Government will serve without compensation from the Federal Government. However, per diem/subsistence reimbursement may be available to assist NCC participants in carrying out the tasks described in Part B.

F. Description of Duties for Which Committee is Responsible

The duties of the NCC will be to gather information and prepare analyses and recommendations concerning the matters listed in Part B above and provide them to the Commission according to the schedule submitted pursuant to Part C above, and within the time frame provided herein.

G. Estimated Annual Operating Costs in Staff Time and Dollars

The estimated annual staff time is four full-time employees for the Commission. The estimated annual operating costs to the Commission for support services provided to the NCC are \$48,600.00.

H. Estimated Number and Frequency of NCC Meetings

The NCC shall meet at least two times per year, and at such other times and at such intervals as the NCC decides. Work is authorized to be carried out by subcommittees, working groups, or task forces using correspondence, facsimile, and teleconferencing.

I. Organization

The NCC is authorized to create any subcommittees that may be necessary to fulfill the NCC's mission. In addition, the NCC is authorized to establish such operating procedures as required to support the group, consistent with the Federal Advisory Committee Act, as amended.

To obtain a broad range of representation, membership for the NCC will be solicited from

local, state and federal public safety agencies, including those individuals responsible for emergency responsiveness, planning, resource management and policy development. In addition, NCC membership also will be solicited from all elements of the manufacturing, technology, public policy, network reliability/design and service provider communities, including representatives with expertise in the planning and design of telecommunications networks that meet public safety and emergency responsiveness needs. Members will serve either as representatives of organizations or as experts in an individual capacity.

J. Charter Termination Date

This charter will terminate on December 24, 2000, prior to which date the Commission will review the work of the Committee and, if necessary seek renewal of this Charter for an additional two-year term. NCC business will be completed September 28, 2002 unless the term of the Committee is expressly extended beyond that time by the Commission.

K. Date Charter is Filed

December 24, 1998.

Please note: The NCC Charter is undergoing non substantive amendments which, among other things, will change the "Date Charter is Filed" to February 25, 1999, thereby to conform the date to that on which the General Services Administration recorded filing of the Charter.

Appendix B

Public Safety National Coordination Committee Rules and Procedures

I. Introduction

The activities of the Public Safety National Coordination Committee (NCC) are governed by the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) and the NCC Charter which are incorporated herein by reference as if fully set forth. In the event of conflict between these rules and procedures and either FACA or the NCC Charter, FACA or the NCC Charter, as appropriate, shall control.

These rules and procedures govern the activities of the NCC membership as a whole, the NCC Steering Committee, the NCC subcommittees and NCC working groups.

II. NCC General Membership

The NCC has an open membership policy whereby any individual may become a member by registering with the NCC. The ultimate decision on approval of the NCC's final recommendations to the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) shall be determined by vote of the eligible NCC general membership present at the NCC meeting at which the final recommendations are submitted for approval. Voting will be limited to one vote per company or other entity. Affiliation of an individual with a company or other entity will be based on that individual's employment or other contractual relationship. Members of trade or professional associations shall not be considered as representatives of such associations unless designated as such by the association. At the request of the person presiding at the meeting, a member may be required to state his or her affiliation, or lack thereof, in writing unless previously disclosed.

There shall be no quorum requirements for such meeting and approval or disapproval of the NCC's final recommendations to the FCC shall be on the basis of the vote of a simple majority of those present. In the event of a tie vote, the deciding vote shall be cast by the NCC Chair. To be eligible to vote at such a meeting, an NCC member must have registered with the NCC at least 90 days prior to the meeting.

To the extent not specified herein, and to the extent consistent with FACA, the conduct of meetings of the general membership shall be governed by Robert's Rules of Order Newly Revised 1990 Edition, Ninth Edition, Sarah Corbin Robert, Henry M. Robert III, and William J. Evans. At meetings of the general membership, the NCC chair shall have the discretion to limit or close discussion and to call for a vote.

III. Steering Committee

A. Role and Purpose

Management of the NCC is committed to a steering committee appointed by the NCC chair. The principal role of the Steering Committee is to furnish the structure under which the NCC will operate, to set policy pursuant to the NCC charter, to support the work of the subcommittees, to operate in compliance with FACA and to present to the general membership for approval or disapproval, a report constituting the NCC's final recommendations to the FCC.

Any steering committee member may designate an alternate to serve in the member's stead at any steering committee meeting. Designation of an alternate must be in writing and submitted to the NCC chair in advance of the meeting. An alternate shall have all of the rights granted herein to a steering committee member except that an alternate may not designate an alternate to serve in his or her stead. Any steering committee member may also give his or her proxy to another member of the steering committee. Proxies shall be submitted to the NCC chair in advance of a meeting and shall only be valid for that meeting.

B. NCC Chair

The steering committee shall be presided over by the NCC chair or by a steering committee member designated by the NCC chair, in writing, to serve as chair *pro tem* in the event of the chair's absence. The NCC chair shall set the agenda of each meeting after consultation with the steering committee and shall determine the time and place of meetings after consultation with the steering committee. The NCC chair shall have the authority to adjourn a steering committee meeting at any time.

C. Public Meetings

All meetings of the steering committee and the NCC general membership shall be open to NCC members and the general public unless a closed meeting is authorized by the general counsel of the FCC pursuant to FACA. Non-decisional discussions among steering committee members generally will not be treated as meetings. Meetings of the steering committee may be held in-person or by telephone conference call. In the event that a meeting is held by conference call, a suitable location shall be provided at which NCC members and the general public may listen to such call and participate in the meeting, at such time as participation is permitted, by submitting questions or comments to a person present at the listening location who shall relay such questions or comments to the participants in the conference call. The NCC shall endeavor to provide a minimum 30 days notice of all meetings.

D. Decisional Process

The steering committee may and should carry out its work informally without the need for formal voting on any given issue. However, at any meeting on the call of any member of the Steering Committee, and upon a quorum being present, a vote of the members present shall be held and the results recorded in the NCC's official record. Upon the call for a vote, each member of the Steering Committee may speak for or against the issue at hand for a time determined by the NCC chair; provided that each member shall have an equal time to speak. In the event of a tie, the chair shall cast the deciding vote.

E. Voting Criteria

If voting is employed, then, except as otherwise provided herein, a simple majority shall be sufficient to carry a vote. Provided, however, that a two-thirds vote shall be required on the decision to submit to the NCC membership for approval or disapproval the final report of the NCC to the Federal Communications Commission. In the case of such vote on submission of the final report to the NCC membership, any steering committee member may supplement his or her vote with a written concurrence or dissent that will be filed with the Federal Communications Commission together with the final report of the NCC

F. Quorum

No vote shall take place unless a quorum of the steering committee is then present. A quorum shall constitute 51% or more of the steering committee members (whether in person or through their alternates). If a quorum is not present, no final action may be taken by the steering committee whether by consensus or otherwise.

G. Representations to Third Parties.

No steering committee member is authorized to speak in the name of the NCC or to supply internal documents of the NCC to third parties other than their sponsoring organizations. These functions are specifically reserved to the NCC chair. Provided, however, that the public shall have access to such documents as are required to be maintained in a public file pursuant to FACA.

H. Roberts Rules of Order.

To the extent not specified herein, and to the extent consistent with FACA, the conduct of meetings including without limitation, debate and voting, shall be governed by Robert's Rules of Order Newly Revised 1990 Edition, Ninth Edition, Sarah Corbin Robert, Henry M. Robert III, and William J. Evans.

IV. Subcommittees

A. Makeup and Role

Subcommittees shall have a chair and a first vice-chair and may also have a second vice-chair. Such chair, first vice-chair or second vice-chair shall be appointed by the NCC chair after consultation with the steering committee. No member of the steering committee shall be eligible to serve as the chair or vice-chair of a subcommittee. The chair, first vice-chair or second vice-chair, as the case may be, shall appoint a secretary to prepare a report of each meeting, including the names of those in attendance, which report shall be submitted to the NCC chair. Subcommittees report to the Steering Committee, not to the Federal Communications Commission, and their work is entirely advisory rather than decisional. The decision concerning the content of the final report constituting the NCC's recommendations to the FCC is reserved to the steering committee and the decision on whether or not such report shall be submitted to the FCC is reserved to the NCC general membership, as described in Section II above.

B. Decisional Process

As a first principle, decision making in the NCC's subcommittees should be directed to consensus. Consensus requires that work toward a solution should continue until substantial agreement is reached. Unanimity, although highly desirable is not a prerequisite to a subcommittee's final recommendations. Consensus contemplates a continual refinement of an issue through discussion, presentations, consideration of reports and studies and other means until the issue is well defined, all feasible solutions have become apparent and the optimum recommendation is made within the schedule set by the steering committee.

1. Informal Voting. Informal voting -- or "straw votes" -- are a useful process to determine whether consensus has been reached on a given issue and, if not, the degree of disagreement present.

2. Formal Voting. Formal voting, in which the subcommittee members attempt to reach a final decision by vote should be a remedy of last resort and marks a failure of the consensus process.

a. Procedure. When all reasonable efforts have been undertaken, without success, to reach consensus, an issue or issues may be resolved through voting. The decision to resolve an issue or issues by vote shall itself be made by voting and a two-thirds majority of eligible voters present shall be required before an issue or issue may be resolved by formal vote.

b. Eligibility. If voting is required, voting eligibility will be established as follows:

(i) Voting will be limited to one vote per company or other entity. Affiliation of an individual with a company or other entity will be based on that individual's employment or other contractual relationship. Members of trade or professional associations shall not be considered as representatives of such associations unless designated as such by the association. At the request of the chair or vice chair presiding at the meeting, a member may be required to state his or her affiliation, or lack thereof, in writing unless previously disclosed. Unresolved disputes concerning eligibility to vote shall be referred to the steering committee for decision. It is contemplated that most disputes will be resolved without a referral, which should be made only as a last resort.

(ii) Steering committee members serving on subcommittees shall abstain from voting on any matter that constitutes a recommendation of a subcommittee to the steering committee, including, without limitation, a subcommittee's interim or final report to the steering committee. However, nothing in the preceding sentence shall be construed to limit a steering committee member's participation in a consensus process that leads to adoption of an interim or final report to the steering committee.

(iii) A subcommittee member may designate an alternate to serve in his or her stead at a subcommittee meeting. Any such designation shall be in writing and submitted to the NCC chair. No person may serve as an alternate for more than one subcommittee member. An alternate shall have all of the rights granted herein to a subcommittee member except that an alternate may not designate an alternate to serve in his or her stead. Voting by proxy shall not be permitted.

There are no quorum requirements for voting by a subcommittee.

C. Meetings

Meetings shall be presided over by the subcommittee chair or, in his or her absence, the first vice-chair, or in his or her absence, the second vice-chair. Should neither the chair nor a vice chair be present, the meeting shall be presided over by a chair *pro tem* agreed to by the subcommittee members present. Meetings of subcommittees shall be held on a scheduled basis with adequate notice given to the subcommittee members. The time and location of subcommittee meetings shall be determined by the NCC chair after consultation with the subcommittee. Meetings of subcommittees may be conducted by electronic means.

D. Communications Among Members

Members of subcommittees are encouraged to communicate informally on matters of interest to the subcommittees. Communications by electronic means among subcommittee members is encouraged, e.g. by conference call, e-mail, list servers and teleconferencing. To the extent available, paper copies of electronic communications should be retained by the subcommittees.

E. Subcommittee Product

The product of subcommittees' deliberations shall be a written report or reports submitted to the NCC chair. Said report or reports shall represent the consensus position of a subcommittee or, when consensus is not attainable, the position of the subcommittee attained by majority vote. In either event, an individual or individuals may supplement the report or reports with a written concurrence or dissent thereto, limited to one company or other entity. These reports, and supplements, if any, will then be reviewed by the steering committee for purposes of developing the final report to the FCC to be submitted to the NCC general membership for approval or disapproval.

F. Working Groups

Working groups may be established by the Steering Committee or by any subcommittee for specific purposes and shall be dissolved by the NCC chair when their function is no longer required. Working groups shall meet informally and shall not be governed by formal procedures including, without limitation, voting.

G. Representations to Third Parties.

No steering committee member is authorized to speak in the name of the NCC or to supply internal documents of the NCC to third parties other than their sponsoring organizations. These functions are specifically reserved to the NCC chair. Provided, however, that the public shall have access to such documents as are required to be maintained in a public file pursuant to FACA.

H. Roberts Rules of Order.

It should not be necessary to invoke formal rules of procedure in connection with subcommittee matters. However, to the extent not specified herein, and to the extent consistent with FACA, the conduct of meetings including without limitation, debate and voting, shall be governed by Robert's Rules of Order Newly Revised 1990 Edition, Ninth Edition, Sarah Corbin Robert, Henry M. Robert III, and William J. Evans.

Appendix C

Public Safety National Coordination Committee (NCC)
Subcommittee Statement of Work

1. Interoperability Subcommittee

General Statement of Work: The Interoperability Subcommittee must formulate draft recommendations that will provide all public safety providers the capability to communicate with one another. This nationwide interoperability plan should include provisions for both day-to-day and emergency interagency communications requirements and, in this connection, recommendations regarding Federal Government users of the 700 MHz interoperability spectrum. To the extent possible, the subcommittee shall build on the work of the Public Safety Advisory Committee (PSWAC) as reflected in the PSWAC Report. Recommendations made to the Steering Committee shall be the collaborative effort of the Interoperability Subcommittee, the Technology Subcommittee and the Implementation Subcommittee. To that end, a subcommittee's chair, vice-chairs and members shall communicate with their counterparts on other subcommittees to ensure that each subcommittee is fully aware of the activities of other subcommittees.

Specific Work Requirements:

- (1) Deliver to the steering committee an operational plan, in the form of a written report, to achieve national interoperability. This plan will be subject to review, approval or change by the steering committee and integrated into a report which, upon approval of the NCC general membership, will be submitted to the Commission.
- (2) include in the operational plan a mechanism to facilitate a shared or priority system among users of the interoperability spectrum (i.e., spectrum in the 700 MHz band specifically designated for interoperability use as well as spectrum in other frequency bands so designated) for day-to-day operations;
- (3) include in the operational plan provisions to address the emergency operation requirements of users of the interoperability spectrum.
- (4) furnish a written recommendation to the steering committee concerning rules and policies to enable development of the national interoperability plan;
- (5) provide in its report, spectrum management and planning mechanisms necessary to develop multiple- user public safety communications systems and local and regional interoperability systems that effectively serve all public safety services providers;

- (6) include in the report, recommendations to the steering committee regarding Federal Government users of the interoperability spectrum;
- (7) offer voluntary assistance in the development of coordinated regional plans;
- (8) include in its report, recommendations to the steering committee concerning the 2.6 MHz of interoperability spectrum designated in the *First Report and Order* in Docket No. 96-86, as well as other spectrum designated by the Commission for interoperability purposes;
- (9) canvas Regional Planning Committees responsible for 800 MHz facilities concerning the extent to which the NPSPAC mutual aid channels have been used;
- (10) assess existing mutual aid plans, including mutual aid frequencies, to determine whether they provide useful information for development of the interoperability plan;
- (11) determine the extent to which NPSPAC regions have provided additional mutual aid channels (beyond 5 nationally designated), and to what extent these have been used;
- (12) interview federal radio managers, frequency coordinators and field agents regarding their experience with use of non-federal frequencies. Employ the information derived to make recommendations concerning federal access to public safety frequencies.
- (13) Determine whether trunking has been implemented on any existing mutual aid channels and licensees' experience with such trunked operation;
- (14) coordinate interoperability subcommittee efforts with those other organizations that are addressing interoperability;
- (15) three weeks prior to the end of each quarter, provide a written progress report to the NCC chair on subcommittee efforts to meet these goals, and a detailed outline of the subcommittee's workplan for the next quarter.

2. Technology Subcommittee

General Statement of Work: This subcommittee shall furnish a report identifying any technical standards/requirements (including protocols) that may be necessary to ensure the most efficient, effective public safety communications systems possible. The subcommittee report should include an analysis of the need for digital modulation, trunking and receiver standards. Where standards/requirements are necessary, the subcommittee must provide draft recommendations for appropriate standards/requirements. The subcommittee also must provide, where appropriate, draft recommendations on other technical matters that are common to the public safety

community generally. To the extent possible, the subcommittee shall build on the work of the Public Safety Advisory Committee (PSWAC) as reflected in the PSWAC Report. Recommendations made to the Steering Committee shall be the collaborative effort of the Interoperability Subcommittee, the Technology Subcommittee and the Implementation Subcommittee. To that end, a subcommittee's chair, vice-chairs and members shall communicate with their counterparts on other subcommittees to ensure that each subcommittee is fully aware of the activities of other subcommittees.

Specific Work Requirements:

- (1) Furnish to the NCC chair by June 15, 1999, a first progress report on the recommendation of technical and equipment standards that includes a plan of action and milestones for the recommendation of each of these standards within a four-year time frame. (The NCC chair must review and submit this report to the FCC no later than June 30, 1999.)
- (2) Survey status of existing applicable standards.
- (3) With respect to existing standards and those under development, identify needed revisions and the additions needed to specify standards for full operability.
- (4) Assess data standards and identify the standards needed to achieve wideband interoperability on channels in 700 MHz band
- (5) Evaluate federal/non-federal receiver standards.
- (6) Assess trunking standards and determine what standards are needed to implement trunking in the 700 MHz band.
- (7) Investigate the availability of standards-compliant products from equipment manufacturers.
- (8) Coordinate technology subcommittee efforts with those of other organizations engaged in setting applicable standards.
- (9) Provide a written report to the steering committee incorporating the subcommittees findings with regard to items (2) - (8) above.
- (9) Three weeks prior to the end of each quarter, provide a written progress report to the NCC chair on subcommittee efforts to meet these goals, and an outline of the subcommittee's workplan for the next quarter.

Working Groups:

(a) Standards Selection Working Group

Specific Work Requirements:

- (1) furnish a written report to the chair of the technology committee, in a timely manner, concerning whether Commission action to require trunking on nationwide interoperability spectrum is necessary or desirable;
- (2) furnish a written report to the to the chair of the technology committee, no later than June 1, 2002, specifying technical standards to achieve full interoperability and network integration (this recommendation is due to the FCC no later than September 28, 2002);
- (3) in developing its recommendations of voluntary technical standards for achieving interoperability, monitor and incorporate where appropriate into a written report, industry standard-setting activities, including those noted in paragraph 113 of the First Report and Order.
- (4) furnish a written report to the to the chair of the technology committee concerning whether to suggest that trunking be employed on all or a portion of the interoperability spectrum and recommend whether the Commission should require trunking on the nationwide interoperability spectrum;
- (5) furnish a written report to the chair of the technology committee regarding the scope of parameters, such as sensitivity, selectivity, dynamic range and reliability and durability characteristics to be included in receiver standards;
- (6) furnish a written report to the chair of the technology committee network concerning redundancy/reliability standards;
- (7) consider other technical standards as may be necessary to provide local, state and federal governments with an interoperable network to meet public safety needs into the next century;
- (8) furnish a written report to the chair of the technology committee concerning technical specifications that determine the spectrum use, efficiency, interoperability, and interference potential of public safety systems;
- (9) ensure that all technical standards recommendations set forth above are developed under the standard setting processes accredited by the American National Standards Institute ("ANSI");

- (10) provide written recommendations to the chair of the technology committee on spectrum management that will encourage efficient and effective spectrum use.
- (12) provide written recommendations to the chair of the technology committee on other technical matters that are common to the public safety community generally.
- (13) incorporate proprietary data into such standards in accordance with ANSI procedures only as necessary;

(b) Competition in Manufacturing Working Group

Specific Work Requirements:

- (1) monitor the development of state-of-the-art technologies that will benefit users in the 700 MHz band and report these findings semi-annually in a written report to the chair of the technology committee;
- (2) develop plans to accommodate new and as yet unanticipated developments in technology and equipment that will add to the usefulness of the 700 MHz band and incorporate them into a written report to the chair of the technology subcommittee;
- (3) provide written recommendations to the chair of the technology subcommittee on spectrum management that will promote competition and avoid undue delays in equipment development;
- (4) ensure that Working Group recommendations are as competitively and technologically-neutral as possible to allow for competing equipment designs

3. Implementation Subcommittee

General Statement of Work: Formulate draft recommendations for implementing the nationwide interoperability plan and incorporate them into a written report to the steering committee; on request, provide assistance in the development of regional plans. To the extent possible, the subcommittee shall build on the work of the Public Safety Advisory Committee (PSWAC) as reflected in the PSWAC Report. Recommendations made to the Steering Committee shall be the collaborative effort of the Interoperability Subcommittee, the Technology Subcommittee and the Implementation Subcommittee. To that end, a subcommittee's chair, vice-chairs and members shall communicate with their counterparts on other subcommittees to ensure that each subcommittee is fully aware of the activities of other subcommittees.

Specific Work Requirements:

- (1) formulate and submit in a written report to the steering committee by November 1, 1999, a set of recommendations to provide to the FCC for the use of interoperability spectrum, including recommendations for Federal Government users, that will allow public safety licensees to make use of such spectrum until final rules are developed (this must be submitted to the Commission no later than February 25, 2000);
- (2) furnish a report to the steering committee as soon as practicable, but in any event no later than November 1, 1999, detailing recommendations on whether the Commission should take action to require trunking on all or a portion of the nationwide interoperability spectrum is needed (this must be submitted to the Commission no later than February 25, 2000);
- (3) monitor the progress of DTV transition to formulate a timetable for launch of public safety spectrum by region and report semi-annually, in writing, to the steering committee;
- (4) provide written policy recommendations on an advisory basis to the regional planning committees in order to ensure the development of coordinated regional plans;
- (5) provide written recommendations to the steering committee on other technology, telecommunications and public policy matters that relate to the expedited planning and deployment of a nationwide interoperable and reliable public safety and emergency responsiveness network;
- (6) Review the NPSPAC National Plan and regional plans as a basis for providing regional planning advice to Regional Planning Committees and summarize findings in a written report to the steering committee.
- (7) If requested by the Regional Planning Committees, develop consistent and cohesive standards for regional planning and detail these standards in a written report to the steering committee.
- (8) If requested by the Regional Planning Committees, develop a dispute-resolution process to resolve differences among regions and within regions and detail the process in a written report to the steering committee.
- (9) If requested by the Regional Planning Committees, assess whether inadequate funding is affecting Regional Planning Committee effectiveness and detail the results of the assessment in a written report to the steering committee.
- (10) Identify candidate locations for accelerated interoperability implementation and

summarize the findings in a written report to the steering committee.

- (11) Coordinate implementation subcommittee efforts with those of organizations engaged in similar efforts and summarize the results in a written report to the steering committee..
- (12) three weeks prior to the end of each quarter, provide a progress report to chair of the NCC on subcommittee efforts to meet these goals, and an outline of the subcommittee's workplan for the next quarter.

\wilhelm\ncc\nccwp.6

Appendix D

PUBLIC SAFETY NATIONAL COORDINATION COMMITTEE AGENDA
Thursday, April 29, 1999

- 10:00-10:20 Welcoming Remarks by Commissioner Ness
- 10:20-10:25 Introduction of the Chair, Kathleen Wallman
- 10:25-10:50 Opening remarks by the Chair
- 10:50-11:00 Remarks by Wireless Telecommunications Bureau Chief, Thomas Sugrue
- 11:00 Introduction of Michael Wilhelm, Designated Federal Officer, FCC
- 11:00-11:05 Introduction of Co-sponsors
- 11:05-11:15 Remarks by NTIA
- 11:15-11:30 Video presentation
- 11:30-11:35 Explanation of the functions of the Steering Committee
- 11:35-11:40 Brief introduction by each Steering Committee member
- 11:40-11:45 Approval of the Meeting Agenda
- 11:45-11:55 Briefing on FACA Rules, Paula Silberthau, FCC Office of the General Counsel
- 11:55-12:05 Briefing on Ex-parte Rules, David Senzel, FCC Office of the General Counsel
- 12:05-12:20 Review of Committee Charter and Timetable
- 12:20-12:30 Discussion of Committee Structure and Organization of the Work
- 12:30-2:00 Lunch break
- 2:00-2:10 Welcome back and overview of afternoon
- 2:10-2:30 Overview of Public Safety issues by D'Wana Terry, Public Safety Private
Wireless Branch Chief, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, FCC
- 2:30-3:00 Overview of PSWAC by Philip Verveer, Partner, Willkie, Farr & Gallagher
- 3:00-3:30 Presentation by Harlin McEwen, Deputy Assistant Director, FBI,
International Association of Chiefs of Police
- 3:30-3:45 Next Steps
- a. Efforts to Ensure Stakeholder Representation
 - b. Review of operating procedures
 - c. Announcement of date and location for next meeting
- 3:45-4:30 Audience Comments
- 4:30 Closing Remarks and Adjourn

Appendix E

**MINUTES OF THE FIRST MEETING OF THE
PUBLIC SAFETY NATIONAL COORDINATION COMMITTEE**

Date/Time: April 29, 1999; Commenced at approximately 10:15 a.m.

Address: Federal Communications Commission
Commission Meeting Room
445 - 12th Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20554

Attendees: See attached list

Opening Remarks (10:15 a.m.)

- **Susan Ness, Commissioner, Federal Communications Commission**, welcomed participants and provided welcoming remarks, acknowledged the presence of various individuals at the meeting, and provided a brief introduction into the background leading up to the formation of the Public Safety National Coordination Committee ("NCC"). Commissioner Ness then introduced Ms. Kathleen Wallman and turned the meeting over to her.
- **Kathleen Wallman, NCC Chair**, presented her opening remarks setting forth the major responsibilities of the NCC. During her presentation, several slides were shown to assist the participants in understanding the NCC's role. Ms. Wallman then introduced Thomas Sugrue.
- **Thomas Sugrue, Chief of the FCC Wireless Telecommunications Bureau**, provided remarks welcoming the participants and thanking them for their interest in the NCC. He also commented that, in Ms. Wallman, the NCC had a very qualified individual as Chair of the NCC. He then handed the meeting back to Ms. Wallman.
- Ms. Wallman introduced **Michael Wilhelm**, who is the Designated Federal Officer ("DFO") for the NCC. Ms. Wallman then introduced the following four individuals from the four Federal Government agencies that are co-sponsors of the NCC, with each representative providing brief remarks acknowledging co-sponsorship:
 - **William Hatch, National Telecommunications Information Administration**
 - **James Downes, Department of the Treasury**
 - **James Turk, Federal Emergency Management Agency**
 - **Ivan Fong, Department of Justice**

A videotape provided by the U.S. Department of Justice was shown. The tape highlighted the difficulty caused by the lack of interoperability among various public safety agencies and the need to implement interoperable systems.

Ms. Wallman provided an explanation of the functions of the NCC Steering Committee and provided the basis by which Steering Committee members were selected. The DFO announced the names of the Steering Committee Members: Marilyn Ward, Steven Proctor, Ernest Hofmeister, Kevin McCarty, Harlin R. McEwen, Bret Hester, Douglas Aiken, Ellen O'Hara, and Louise Renne. Ms. Renne had a statement read by the DFO because of her absence.

Approval of the Meeting Agenda (attached) was sought from the attendees, and approval was given unanimously.

Ms. Wallman announced that June 18, 1999, would be the date for NCC's second meeting, which will be held at FCC Headquarters. She requested that all NCC participants provide their E-mail addresses.

A short break was taken from approximately 11:05 a.m. until approximately 11:25 a.m.

- **Paula Silberthau, FCC, Office of General Counsel**, provided a short briefing on the Federal Advisory Committee Act ("FACA") Rules.
- **David Senzel, FCC, Office of General Counsel**, provided a briefing on the Commission's *ex parte* rules and how they affect the proceedings of the NCC.
- The DFO announced that two other Steering Committee Members, Rick Murphy and Mayor Clarence Harmon, inadvertently were not mentioned earlier.

The morning session concluded at approximately 11:50 a.m.

Afternoon Session – the meeting reconvened at approximately 1:35 p.m.

- **Kathleen Wallman** opened the session.
- **D'wana R. Terry, Chief, Public Safety & Private Wireless Division, Wireless Telecommunications, Bureau, FCC**, presented an overview of public safety issues.
- **Philip Verveer, Willkie, Farr & Gallagher**, presented an overview of the Public Safety Wireless Advisory Committee (an earlier FACA committee).
- **Harlin R. McEwen, Deputy Assistant Director, FBI, International Association of Chiefs of Police**, presented an overview of public safety from a law enforcement perspective.
- **Ms. Wallman** stated that anyone who would be interested in being part of the NCC's subcommittees identify themselves to the DFO by May 10, 1999. She repeated the date of June 18, 1999, for the second NCC meeting.

Audience Comments:

- **Paul Fishman**, Friedman, Kaplan & Seidler, was introduced by Ms. Wallman to moderate the audience comments portion of the meeting.
- **Bob Gurss** commented about the need to make sure that substantive matters were implemented by the NCC.
- **Dave Buchanan** commented on future meetings and days of the week for such meetings from an administrative viewpoint.
- **John Powell**, University of California at Berkeley, said that his university could host NCC meetings on the West Coast. He also stated that the NCC will need to address issues pertaining to standards and interoperability quickly.
- **Art McDole** mentioned that complete trunking standards are not yet in place.
- **Richard DeMello** mentioned that standards and economics go together. He also addressed interoperability issues.
- **Harlin R. McEwen** discussed the need for balance between the needs of fire departments and the needs of law enforcement, e.g., law enforcement's more frequent need for encrypted communication.
- **Rick Murphy** commented that there have been reports of a need for encryption in fire fighting.
- **Don Pfohl** commented that disparate systems need the least common denominator in a digital world.
- **James Downes**, Department of the Treasury, commented that much time previously has been spent defining interoperability.
- **Carlton Wells**, State of Florida, commented that EMS (Emergency Medical Service) continues to require extensive communications capability. He also stated that the backing of Federal guidelines carries some weight and that supplemental funding is needed regarding interoperability.
- **Kathleen Wallman** said that some procedures for the NCC still are evolving. She also said that some Steering Committee Members might be Members on an alternating basis. She emphasized that any NCC recommendations would be from the NCC as a whole but that the great reliance would be placed on the work of the subcommittees.

- **Robert Schlieman**, New York State Police, commented that for interoperability, there must be standards and, thus, a standard baseline is needed.
- An unnamed individual suggested that the NCC's open membership could result in disproportionate representation of particular interests on the Committee with a concomitant skewing of the NCC's recommendations to the FCC.

Closing Remarks

The DFO said that Commissioner Powell was testifying before Congress that same day about Y2K (Year 2000) matters and that a copy of his testimony was available outside the Commission Meeting Room for anyone who might be interested.

Ms. Wallman adjourned the meeting at approximately 3:05 p.m.

Prepared by: Bert Weintraub
Attorney Advisor
Public Safety & Private Wireless Division
Wireless Telecommunications Bureau
Federal Communications Commission

Certified as to accuracy:



Kathleen Wallman

Date: 6/8/99

PUBLIC SAFETY NATIONAL COORDINATION COMMITTEE
(Participants/Attendees - April 29, 1999)

CO-SPONSORING AGENCIES

James Downes	Department of the Treasury
Ivan Fong	Department of Justice
William Hatch	National Telecommunications Information Administration
James Turk	Federal Emergency Management Agency

CHAIR AND STEERING COMMITTEE

Douglas Aiken	International Association of Fire Chiefs
Bret Hester	National Governors Association
Ernest Hofmeister	Ericsson Private Radio Systems
Harlin R. McEwen	International Association of Chiefs of Police; also, Federal Bureau of Investigation
Rick Murphy	Department of the Treasury
Ellen O'Hara	Motorola
Kathleen Wallman	Chair of the Public Safety National Coordination Committee
Marilyn Ward	Chairman, National Public Safety Telecommunications
Council	

FCC STAFF

Joy Alford	Public Safety and Private Wireless Division
Melva DiGirolamo	Public Safety and Private Wireless Division
Solita Griffis	Public Safety and Private Wireless Division
Kathryn Hosford	Public Safety and Private Wireless Division
Maryanne McCormick	Public Safety and Private Wireless Division
Raven Morris	Public Safety and Private Wireless Division (School Intern)
Susan Ness	Commissioner
Kathleen O'Brien-Ham	Deputy Chief, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau
Josh Roland	Legal Advisor, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau
David Senzel	Office of General Counsel
Paula Silberthau	Office of General Counsel
Thomas Sugrue	Chief, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau
D'wana Terry	Chief, Public Safety and Private Wireless Division
Bert Weintraub	Public Safety and Private Wireless Division
Michael Wilhelm	Designated Federal Officer
Herb Zeiler	Public Safety and Private Wireless Division

PUBLIC SAFETY NATIONAL COORDINATION COMMITTEE AGENDA
Thursday, April 29, 1999

- 10:00-10:20 Welcoming Remarks by Commissioner Ness
- 10:20-10:25 Introduction of the Chair, Kathleen Wallman
- 10:25-10:50 Opening remarks by the Chair
- 10:50-11:00 Remarks by Wireless Telecommunications Bureau Chief, Thomas Sugrue
- 11:00 Introduction of the Michael Wilhelm, Designated Federal Officer, FCC
- 11:00-11:05 Introduction of Co-sponsors
- 11:05-11:15 Remarks by NTIA
- 11:15-11:30 Video presentation
- 11:30-11:35 Explanation of the functions of the Steering Committee
- 11:35-11:40 Brief introduction by each Steering Committee member
- 11:40-11:45 Approval of the Meeting Agenda
- 11:45-11:55 Briefing on FACA Rules, Paula Silberthau, FCC Office of the General Counsel
- 11:55-12:05 Briefing on Ex-parte Rules, David Senzel, FCC Office of the General Counsel
- 12:05-12:20 Review of Committee Charter and Timetable
- 12:20-12:30 Discussion of Committee Structure and Organization of the Work
- 12:30-2:00 Lunch break
- 2:00-2:10 Welcome back and overview of afternoon
- 2:10-2:30 Overview of Public Safety issues by D'Wana Terry, Public Safety Private
Wireless Branch Chief, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, FCC
- 2:30-3:00 Overview of PSWAC by Philip Verveer, Partner, Willkie, Farr & Gallagher
- 3:00-3:30 Presentation by Harlan McEwen, Deputy Assistant Director, FBI,
International Association of Chiefs of Police
- 3:30-3:45 Next Steps
 - a. Efforts to Ensure Stakeholder Representation
 - b. Review of operating procedures
 - c. Annoucement of date and location for next meeting
- 3:45-4:30 Audience Comments
- 4:30 Closing Remarks and Adjourn

**Cumulative List of Attendees at the April 29, 1999, Meeting
of the Public Safety National Coordination Committee**

Joy Alford
Rosalind Allen
Don Appleby
Barbara Baffer
Rich Baumgardner
Martin Bercovici
Margot Bester
Sgt. Bruce Blair
Michael Bracy
David Buchanan
Joseph Byrnes CEM
Alex Calderon
Alan Caldwell
Thomas Chirhart
Norman Coltri
Daniel Cottrill
Peter Daronco
Renaë Davis
Richard DeMello
Celeste Descoteaux
Robert Desourdis
Melva DiGiralamo
James Downes
Walt Eccles
David Eierman
Robert Fenichel
Andrea Fisher
Paul Fishman

Leo Fitzsimon
Robert Fogel
Ivan Fong
Merri Gamble
Fred Griffen
Solita Griffis
Robert Gurss
Kathleen Ham
Ron Haraseth
William Hatch
Susan Heselton
Ernest Hofmeister Dr.
Michael Hunter
Bob Insminger
Ken Jordan
Carl Kain, PE
Brett Kilbourne
Scott Leonard
Timothy Loewenstein
Paul May
Art McDole
Harlin McEwen
Alfred Mello
Larry Miller
Thomas Miller
Michael Monahan
Susan Moore
Rick Murphy
Glen Nash
Susan Ness

Ellen O'Hara
Rich Orsulak
Jack Osland
Don Pfohl
John Powell
Josh Roland
Robert Schlieman
David Senzel
Joe Sifer
Paula Silberthau
Jeff Silva
Brenna Smith
McRae Smith
Victor Sparrow
Robert Speidel Esq.
Don Speights
Vincent Stile
Thomas Struzzieri
Thomas Sugrue
D'Wana Terry
James Turk
Philip Verveer
David Walchitk
Kathleen Wallman
Marilyn Ward
Stefani Watkerson
Bert Weintraub
Carlton Wells
Fred Wentland
Paul Wieck II

Michael Wilhelm

John Yallaruli

Robert Zarnock

Herb Zeiler

Appendix F

AGENDA
Public Safety National Coordination Committee
June 18, 1999

- 10:00-10:05 Welcoming Remarks & Introduction of Commissioner Furchtgott-Roth
Kathy Wallman, Chair, NCC
- 10:05-10:15 Remarks by Commissioner Furchtgott-Roth
- 10:15-10:20 Overview of the Day, Approval of the Agenda
Kathy Wallman
- 10:20 – 10:30 Adoption of NCC Governance Document
- 10:30-11:00 Technology Subcommittee Report
- 11:00-11:30 Interoperability Subcommittee Report
- 11:30-12:00 Implementation Subcommittee Report
- 12:00-12:30 Open Mike Audience Participation
- 12:30-1:00 Bruce Franca, FCC Office of Engineering and Technology
The Transition to Digital Television
- 1:00-2:00 Lunch Break
- 2:00-2:10 Welcome Back and Overview of the Afternoon: Kathy Wallman
- 2:10-2:30 Steven Proctor, Public Safety Wireless Network
The Utah Communications Agency Network
- 2:30-3:00 Jane Schweiker, ANSI Director of Public Policy and Government Relations
Advantages of the ANSI Process
- 3:00-3:30 Other Business, Next Steps, Announcement of Next Meeting Dates,
Closing Remarks
Kathy Wallman
- 4:00 Adjourn

Appendix G

MINUTES OF THE SECOND MEETING OF THE PUBLIC SAFETY NATIONAL COORDINATION COMMITTEE

Date/Time: June 18, 1999; Commenced at 10:00 a.m.

Address: Federal Communications Commission
Commission Meeting Room
445 - 12th Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20554

Participants: See attached list

Opening Remarks (10:00 a.m.)

- **Kathleen Wallman**, National Coordination Committee ("NCC") Chair, called to order the second meeting of the NCC. After ascertaining that no one needed the benefit of sign-language interpretation, she then introduced Commissioner Furchtgott-Roth.
- **Harold Furchtgott-Roth**, Commissioner, Federal Communications Commission, welcomed all attendees at the meeting, thanked Ms. Wallman for chairing the NCC, pointed out that both the FCC and Congress recognize the importance of public safety communications, explained that the FCC needs input from the NCC, expressed the Commission's willingness to facilitate the NCC's discussions, recognized the difficulty of the NCC's task, and expressed appreciation for all of the NCC's efforts.
- Ms. Wallman introduced the leadership of the NCC's Subcommittees and, for acknowledgement, requested that they stand. (a) Interoperability Subcommittee: Chair is **Sgt. John Powell** of the University of California; First Vice Chair is **Kyle Sinclair** of the Treasury Department; and Second Vice Chair is **Steve Souder** of Arlington County, Virginia, Emergency Communications Center; (b) Technology Subcommittee: Chair is **Glen Nash** of the Telecommunications Division of California, Department of General Services; First Vice Chair is **Don Ashley** of the FBI; Second Vice Chair is **Steven Jennings**, Telecommunications Manager of Harris County, Texas; (3) Implementation Subcommittee: Chair is **Ted Dempsey** of the New York City Police Department; Second Vice Chair is **Richard DeMello**, Telecommunications Administrator of the Michigan Department of Natural Resources; and that the First Vice Chair is in the process of being recruited because an intended individual from FEMA was unable to take the position. All named Subcommittee leaders were present except Ted Dempsey.
- Ms. Wallman provided a brief overview of the day, based on the agenda provided to attendees at the sign-in table at the entrance to the meeting room.
- *Adoption of the NCC Governance Document.* Ms. Wallman announced that through conversations with the NCC's Steering Committee, procedural rules for the NCC had

been adopted and incorporated into the document *NCC Public Safety Rules and Procedures* ("Governance Document"). She pointed out that the procedures established for decision-making for the NCC would be made by consensus, that, generally, voting would be treated as a last resort with the exception that there would be a vote by the general membership on approval of the Final Report of the NCC to be submitted to the FCC. Ms. Wallman stated that based on the advice and concurrence of the Steering Committee, she was adopting the Governance Document and that copies of this Document were being made available at the meeting and also would be available on the NCC Web page.

- *NCC Subcommittee Reports*

Ms. Wallman stated that the core of the day's meeting would center on the reports of the NCC's Subcommittees (which met the day before). She pointed out that **Michael Wilhelm**, Designated Federal Official to the NCC, attended all three Subcommittee meetings in her absence, and that Mr. Wilhelm informed her that the Subcommittee meetings went exceptionally well and made substantial progress. Ms. Wallman then requested that each Subcommittee Chair give a report of the previous day's Subcommittee progress.

Interoperability Subcommittee Report. John Powell, Chair, presented in summary fashion the Interoperability Subcommittee Report. He said the Subcommittee first adopted definitions from the PSWAC Final Report for "public safety" and "interoperability," reviewed the various tasks assigned to it from the Steering Committee, and divided the tasks among five Working Groups which were established as follows: (1) Drafting Group, with Bob Schlieman from the New York State Police as Chair; (2) Operational Group, with Kyle Sinclair of the U.S. Treasury as Chair; (3) Rules, Policy and Spectrum Planning, with Carlton Wells from the State of Florida, as Chair; (4) Information Gathering and Liaison With Outside Groups, with Don Pfohl of the City of Mesa, Arizona, as Chair; (5) Trunking Interoperability Channels Group, with Dave Buchanan of the County of San Bernadino, California, as Chair.

Sgt. Powell said time lines were put in place for the Working Groups and specifically for the Trunking Interoperability Channels Working Group, with the latter to be presenting a report at the NCC meeting in September, and the other Working Groups presenting reports at the November Subcommittee meeting. He also said that a LISTSERVE was established for each of the five Subcommittee Working Groups as follows: <IOWG1-IOWG5 [for Working Groups One through Five, respectively] @NTOC@NET.NET>. He added that a good cross-section of the country and the layers of government involved as appropriate were represented on each working group. Via a Power Point presentation, he then discussed and elaborated on: the Interoperability Definition, Types of Interoperability (*i.e.*, Day-to-Day, Mutual Aid, Task Force); Interoperability Technologies (*i.e.* Conventional, Analog Trunked, Project 25-

Digital, Infrastructure Based); The Future; "So Why Can't We Talk" problems; and how do we correct this situation.

Mr. Powell said his report would be posted to the NCC Web Page as would be the Subcommittee's formal minutes of its meeting.

Ms. Wallman stated that the NCC was obligated to provide a progress report to the FCC at the end of June, and that the core of periodic reports to the FCC would consist of such progress reports setting forth the work of the Subcommittees, and also would include material such as Sgt. Powell's presentation as well as narratives and minutes of Subcommittee meetings. [Editorial note: it was later determined that the report is due in August.] Both Sgt. Powell and Ms. Wallman noted that Tim Lowenstein has been quite instrumental and helpful in ensuring that information is being placed on the NCC Web Page.

Technology Subcommittee Report. Glen Nash, Chair, presented in summary fashion (via Power Point presentation) the Technology Subcommittee Report. He reviewed the Subcommittee leadership structure, identified five Working Groups per the Steering Committee's Statement of Work, discussed each Group's responsibilities, and named the Working Group Chairs. (1) Voice Standards Working Group, with Robert Schlieman, New York State Police, as Chair. Mr. Nash said that two motions raised at the Subcommittee meeting seeking FCC recommendation of certain ANSI air interface and vocoder standards were tabled pending the Working Group's analysis of the pros and cons for later presentation at the September meeting, with a hoped-for a decision at the November meeting. Mr. Nash discussed the need for quick action in transitioning to digital technology, especially given the FCC's Public Safety Report and Order ("FCC R&O") (which, *inter alia*, designated 2.6 MHz for nationwide interoperability purposes among public safety agencies and announced the FCC's plan to establish the NCC). He said the Subcommittee had several questions (e.g., matters related to trunking, fleet mapping, who would build the interoperability system and how would it be built) that would have to be addressed by the Steering Committee. (2) Non-voice Standards Working Group, with Dave Buchanan, County of San Bernadino, as Chair. Mr. Nash said, likewise, the Subcommittee had a question (*i.e.*, concerning transport layers and application layers) which required guidance from the Steering Committee. (3) Receiver Standards Working Group, with Don Pfohl of Mesa, Arizona, as Chair. (4) Spectrum Utilization Working Group, with Ron Haraseth, APCO-Intl., Chair; (5) Competition in Manufacturing Working Group, with Steve Jennings, Harris County, Texas, as Chair. He also said that a separate Writing Working Group, chaired by Don Ashley, would put together Working Group reports. Mr. Nash said there still was room for more individuals to sign up to be on the Subcommittee.

Implementation Subcommittee Report. Richard DeMello, Second Vice Chair, presented in summary fashion (by narrative format) the Implementation Subcommittee report. He commented that the previous day's work of three Subcommittee was

encouraging. He said that five Working Groups were created, and Chairs appointed. (1) Writing Group, with Ted Dempsey as Chair. Mr. DeMello said this Group would write reports that would be due to the NCC; (2) DTV Transition Working Group, with Dave Eierman of Motorola, as Chair. Mr. DeMello said that he hoped a fair amount of information would be gathered and made known for the September meeting concerning where 700 MHz public safety spectrum could be deployed consistent with television allocations. (3) Policy-Regional Planning Working Group, with Frederick Griffin as Chair. Mr. DeMello stated that the real task of the Subcommittee would be to develop all requested items and that standards baselines for giving guidance to the RPCs would be available. (4) Technology Policy Working Group, with Ali Shahnami as Chair. Mr. DeMello said he hoped to have information put together for the September meeting and for the December report. (5) Inter Subcommittee Coordination Working Group, with Don Pfohl as Chair, would coordinate with the other Subcommittees. Mr. DeMello said the Subcommittee discussed: hoping to have documentation for the September meeting for making a recommendation that there be an FCC mandate put on receivers being produced in the U.S. to be DTV-type by a certain date, with the date to be determined later; DTV penetration; strong policy requirements being necessary for regional planning; engineering analysis to be developed by the Subcommittee for September and included in the November Report; the need for a data base, and adoption of signal standards.

A short break was taken from approximately 11:00 a.m. until 11:15 a.m., whereupon the meeting resumed.

- Open Mike Audience Participation

Ms. Wallman introduced **Scott Harris**, Harris, Wiltshire & Grannis, as moderator. Ms. Wallman said that the time could be used to address Subcommittee leaders because the Subcommittees are the core of progress. Comment was also solicited on issues surrounding DTV (*i.e.*, Digital Television). The following individuals spoke, in the order shown below (several persons spoke more than once), and their comments and questions are briefly summarized below.

John Powell said he sent an E-mail to Ms. Wallman and Mr. Wilhelm earlier this week suggesting changes in overall work guidelines from the Steering Committee pertaining to changing terminology. He hoped that the NCC Steering Committee would provide input on certain tasks *vis-a-vis* DTV and especially Task No. 8, which was given to the Interoperability Subcommittee.

Ernest Hofmeister of Ericsson and Steering Committee member, asked Mr. Nash, Technology Subcommittee Chair, if assessment/cost model/technology-readiness parameters (based on, *e.g.*, various modulation approaches) and estimates of the number of needed radios could be developed to assess the practicality of approaches. He suggested an additional work task involving technology readiness or practicality in terms of cost models be considered. He also stated IPRs (*i.e.*, intellectual property

rights) issues must be added and addressed.

Glen Nash, responding to Mr. Hofmeister, said that the Subcommittee would have to turn back to the manufacturers for such information and needed manufacturers' guidelines for the ease or difficulty of various modulation techniques, and that users don't have such information. He said that estimating the marketplace may be harder to achieve other than saying that the entire public safety community is the relevant market. He pointed out that there is a large embedded base in such usage.

Bob Gurss, Wilkes, Artis, Hendrick & Lane, addressing the IPR issue, said he thought the FCC required ANSI or other entity's standards (e.g., ITA) because they encompass guidelines for ensuring other IPOs are available whereas such an issue is well beyond the expertise of most of the public safety group present in the meeting and, thus, reliance on other bodies' decisions would be helpful.

Harlin McEwen, returning to Mr. Hofmeister's remarks, said that arriving at costs is not easy to do. He said that if he went to Motorola to ask how much 700 Mhz equipment would cost, it would be hard to arrive at figures. He gave an example of live scan fingerprint devices which started at about \$70,000 and said that, while there have been improvements and refinements, prices essentially have gone down to around \$25,000 because more people are buying them. He said there should be some reasonable way to get "ballpark" figures from manufacturers for 700 MHz equipment.

Art McDole, APCO, and also co-chair of the steering committee for Project 25, expressed vital concern about interoperability. He said that the idea is to get as many people speaking to one another as possible and that a common mode was needed. He applauded the FCC for allowing the balance of the 700 MHz band allotment to be open to any technique chosen, whether digital or otherwise. He stated that, for interoperability, both modulation techniques and vocoders must match or there will not be interoperability. He added that Project 25 now appears to be the most logical choice, especially with ANSI standards involved and that the goal was to try getting the most people into interoperability.

Joe Gallelli, President of the Gallelli Group, said that today's technology differs from that which existed ten years ago and, thus, allows for thinking in much broader terms. He said that some consideration should be given to new technologies. He thus stated that, consequently, there should be no rush to judgment on any one technology and that a good evaluation should be given to all possibilities.

Robert Schlieman, New York State Police, said that his Working Group has no way of independently verifying cost data that would be received from the manufacturers. He said that the problem in the United States, unlike Europe, is that there is not a tight geographic area. He said that to communicate with others not in the system

requires a baseline standard for interoperability. He also said if there were to be crossband interoperability, there would be a need to at least have compatible vocoders for digital-to-digital communications. Thus, he said there are reasons for having a baseline standard for interoperability.

Ernest Hofmeister responded to Mr. Schlieman and said that he was trying to get an engineering judgment about degrees of difficulty and that he was not asking for precise estimates. He said he would volunteer to help provide cost estimates and was simply looking for relative comparisons.

Robert Schlieman said that, regarding IPRs, he had meetings on the subject and has made inquiries of the European Technical Standards Institute concerning IPR requirements of the Institute.

Don Pfohl, City of Mesa, Arizona, said that the output of NCC recommendations must be a balance of interests but that it should be focused on public safety and not manufacturing. He said that the public safety draws from federal, state, and local governments. He stated that the NCC might very well err but in doing so, it should err on the side of the public safety issues and not on behalf of with manufacturing issues.

Fred Griffin said that the NCC Steering Committee should have a procedure whereby individuals would be excluded from subcommittees if they failed to attend a set number of meetings.

Michael Wilhelm, DFO, at the request of Ms. Wallman, responded to Mr. Griffin, saying that he recalled that the sense of the Steering Committee was that participants are volunteers and it would be unreasonable to remove someone from the NCC or a subcommittee for non-attendance at meetings. He noted, though, that the only requirement concerning attendance is that in order to vote on final NCC recommendations to the FCC, an individual must be a member of the NCC within the preceding 90 days of the vote. [Editor's note: Mr. Wilhelm inadvertently referred to a "90-day requirement" that had been deleted from the Governance Document.]

Glen Nash, State of California and Chair of the Technology Subcommittee, said that costs to inform people were essentially zero, costs to send out information were negligible, and it was important to keep people informed. He stated that, as for attendance and participation, the issue is whether the person is knowledgeable on the subject to be voted on. He said that the expectation was that not many votes would be taken but, rather, a consensus or unanimity should prevail.

John Powell said that, with electronic communications, conveyance of NCC information is relatively easy but that the cost of travel to participate in face-to-face meetings is beyond what many agencies can support. Thus, he said, it is difficult to limit participation on the basis of one's inability to get to meetings.

Carlton Wells, State of Florida, said that based on the draft of the NCC voting procedures, it appears that no quorum is required at meetings if a vote is called. He stated that if a vote is necessary, it is really necessary to reach consensus. Moreover, if one is not present when a decision is made, that person loses the right to have the matter reconsidered. He reiterated what previously was said, namely, that a vote (except for the final NCC report to the FCC) is evidence of failure.

Sal DiRaimo, New York State Technology Enterprise Corporation, suggested that, under the auspices of, e.g., NTIA, metrics should be developed so that they can be associated with the level of difficulty and that they be given to the appropriate NCC Subcommittees in order to get an understanding of the complexity vs. cost factors of various types of technology.

Kathleen Wallman, in response to Mr. DiRaimo, pointed out that NTIA is a co-sponsoring agency of the NCC, that it is an active participant, and that it would be therefore helpful in this regard. She inquired of an NTIA member present at the meeting about the suggestion.

Rich Orsulak, NTIA, in response, said that NTIA would like to help out as much as it can but he would have to take the matter under advisement because Don Speights was not present at the meeting.

Art McDole sought clarification regarding votes in relation to interim reports. He asked whether, given that the FCC R&O requires interim reports to the FCC on an ongoing basis, a vote was required in order for these interim reports to be given to the FCC.

Kathleen Wallman, in response to Mr. McDole, said that committee votes are not needed for interim reports but that she would have to consult with the Steering Committee regarding interim reports. Moreover, she said the NCC would consult with the FCC regarding the contents of such reports.

Bob Gurss asked whether there could be decisions made regarding recommendations involving digital standards before the NCC Final Report is given to the FCC. Ms. Wallman replied that she hoped so.

Dave Buchanan, County of San Bernadino and also representing the Southern Chapter of APCO, sought help regarding current allocations for DTV allocations that are precluding use of the new spectrum in Southern California. He requested ideas to speed up the departure of existing analog systems occupying that spectrum. He reminded attendees that the PSWAC process indicated a need for substantial amounts of spectrum in Southern California.

Robert Schlieman inquired about the Part IV Subcommittee decisional process concerning a subcommittee member's designating an alternate to serve at a subcommittee meeting. He asked whether it would be appropriate to submit the designation to the subcommittee chair for forwarding to Ms. Wallman, the NCC Chair.

Kathleen Wallman, in response, said that, yes, it would be appropriate in that the designation be done in advance via e-mail and that she was willing to delegate the designation to the Subcommittee chairs. Consequently, she affirmatively stated that this policy would be accepted.

Don Ashley, FBI and also with PSWN, said that the 800 MHz study which was produced under PSWIN auspices by Booz Allen was available at the following PSWN Web site: <www.pswn.gov>. He also said that various documents, namely, the Wireless Communications Interoperability Guide, the Public Safety Radio Spectrum Guide, the PSWN Program Analysis of Fire and EMS Communications Interoperability and documents, and fliers pertaining to the September PSWN Lansing, Michigan, symposium, were available at the sign-in table.

John Powell stated that the next meeting dates, especially for the San Francisco meeting, should be locked in quickly for planning purposes.

Ms. Wallman, in response, announced that September 24, 1999, would be the date for the next NCC meeting that will be held in Lansing, Michigan. She pointed out that the Subcommittees would meet the day before, September 23, 1999, for one-half day following the PSWN symposium. Ms. Wallman also said that November 19, 1999, would be the date for the NCC meeting in San Francisco, with the Subcommittees meeting on November 18, 1999. Based on audience comments, it was observed that the San Francisco meeting would conflict with the November 19th Radio Club of America meeting in New York. Ms. Wallman then said calendars would be reviewed over lunch, and that she would confer with Jayne Lee, City and County of San Francisco, to arrive at options for other meeting dates to resolve conflicts. [Editor's note: The meeting subsequently was transferred to New York City. See page 11 below.]

- **Ms. Wallman** then introduced **Bruce Franca, FCC, Office of Engineering and Technology**, who gave a presentation concerning the transition to Digital Television ("DTV") (via overhead slides). He provided background on DTV regarding initial DTV allotments, indicating that Channels 60-69 were slated for early recovery and Channels 52-59 are to be recovered at the end of the transition. He discussed Channels 60-69 designations, pointing out that Channels 60-62 and 65-67 were designated for commercial operations and that Channels 63-64 and 68-69 have been designated for the public safety community. Mr. Franca also discussed DTV service rules and build-out schedules, pointing out that network stations in the top 10 markets must begin DTV service by May, 1999, and that network stations in the top 30

markets must begin such service by November, 1999. He also provided the current DTV construction status. Mr. Franca pointed out that the public safety community's main concerns would center on Channel 62 because it is an adjacent channel which would need protection, with traditional land mobile rules governing protection requirements, and also Channel 63. Mr. Franca showed separation distance contours for analog and digital Channels 62, 63, 64, 65, 67, 68, and 69, with maps showing adjacent and co-channel separations for each Channel.

At the conclusion of Mr. Franca's presentation, there were questions, comments, observations, and concerns directed to him from Robert Schlieman, John Powell, David Eierman, Bob Gurss, and Dave Buchanan. These matters, collectively, pertained generally to the following: ability to obtain copies of Mr. Franca's visuals; the Philadelphia, PA, DTV Channel 63 assignment; the number of the Top-10 markets meeting their May 1, 1999, deadlines; the lack of DTV audiences on the West Coast (specifically, the San Francisco area); the radius of adjacent and co-channel circles shown on Mr. Franca's slides; what analog and DTV stations were included, e.g., licensed stations, applications, etc., in terms of DTV eligibility criteria; the Canadian DTV allocation along the Canadian-U.S. border; the need to overlay all maps used by Mr. Franca in one graphic to better understand adjacent and co-channel preclusion/protection standards; provisions for protecting part of an adjacent channel as opposed to the entire channel; issues and status of converters, relative to the calculation of penetration percentages; mandatory date for all TV sets being capable of DTV reception; and must-carry issues; Mr. Franca addressed all matters directed to him by answering, clarifying, and amplifying as appropriate.

Ms. Wallman summed up the positions of those present by asking Mr. Franca if there were any possible way to accelerate the transition to DTV by the FCC and that the sense of the group was that even small actions that the FCC might take to reinforce marketplace incentives for broadcasters to move off the channels assigned for public safety use would be appreciated by the public safety community. Mr. Franca responded that he hoped the transition would go very quickly, that things seemed to be working well to date.

- Ms. Wallman introduced an alternate for Mayor Harmon (member of the Steering Committee unable to attend the meeting), namely, Lt. Thomas Perchich, St. Louis Police Department.
- Ms. Wallman also announced that paper copies of the Minutes of the NCC Subcommittee meetings (held the previous day, June 17, 1999) would be made available after lunch.
- Ms. Wallman shared a message from the FCC that the Department of Justice ("DOJ") would be organizing a July 15, 1999, two-hour Y2K broadcast coordinated with the FCC. She said that DOJ was asking whether any police chiefs, fire chiefs,

etc) wished to participate in the program; Ms. Wallman said if so, they should contact Michael Wilhelm so he could pass on the names to the Y2K personnel at the FCC; and that rehearsals for the broadcast would be held on July 14, 1999. Mr. Wilhelm said that all expenses would be paid by the FBI.

- Ms. Wallman introduced **Steven Proctor**, Director, Utah Communications Agency Network ("UCAN"). Mr. Proctor provided a presentation centering on the political, technical, financial, and regulatory issues of implementing what he termed a complex undertaking such as UCAN, which, he said, is a quasi-governmental entity. He provided an historical perspective leading up to the UCAN and discussed the Task Force findings centering on general findings and the number of radio systems in use; the Task Force's recommendations and estimated costs (statewide). Mr. Proctor showed a site map indicating an eight-county area within which service would be provided and showing current and planned links. He mentioned that the opportunity to host the Olympics in Year 2002 spurred development of the project. Focusing on the eight-county area, Mr. Proctor discussed particulars of the costs and focus of development, discussed where it stands today, and the interoperability design, which, he pointed out, is not yet firmed up.

At the conclusion of Mr. Proctor's presentation, there were questions and comments directed to him from **Carlton Wells**, **Larry Miller**, and **John Powell**, pertaining to, collectively, issues of mutual aid coverage systems in relation to non-mutual aid coverage systems, the migration date for NPSPAC channels and "give-back" channels, whether stand-alone or sub-systems would operate in a larger system and if so, whether interoperability talk groups would operate in a trunked mode. Mr. Proctor responded.

- Ms. Wallman returned to the matter of options for the NCC and Subcommittee November meeting dates in order to narrow the options and establish acceptable dates. Based on audience input, various dates in November and December were discussed. Ms. Wallman said that Ted Dempsey would be called over lunch, that Jayne Lee of San Francisco would inquire further of San Francisco, and that Ms. Wallman would confer with Ms. Lee and John Powell over the lunch break in helping to arrive at an acceptable date.

- The morning session concluded at approximately 1:05 p.m., and Ms. Wallman announced that the meeting would resume at 2:00 p.m.

Afternoon Session -- the meeting reconvened at approximately 2:10 p.m.

- **Kathleen Wallman** opened the session by announcing that copies of the Subcommittee meeting minutes and a limited number of copies of Mr. Franca's presentation were at the sign-in table (with additional copies to be made available later).

Ms. Wallman stated that there were two plans regarding the November 18 and 19 meeting dates in New York: Plan A was to use the New York, Police Department's office, with Ted Dempsey making arrangements (the primary plan) and Plan B was to ask industry members of the Steering Committee to arrange for a New York meeting location. She also pointed out that because the Subcommittees would be meeting after the PSWN symposium in Lansing, they would only have about one-half day on September 23. Thus, she stated that part of the NCC general membership meeting scheduled on September 24 would be allotted for Subcommittee meeting time that Friday morning, with Subcommittee reports presented Friday afternoon.

A short break was taken until 2:30 p.m.

- Ms. Wallman introduced **Jane Schweiker**, American National Standards Institute ("ANSI") Director of Public Policy and Government Relations, who gave an overview of ANSI. She explained ANSI's two primary functions (in the domestic arena, ANSI accredits standards developing organizations and in the international area, ANSI is the U.S. representative for U.S. participation in the International Standards Organization, the International Electro Technical Commission, and other non-treaty organizations). She stated ANSI's mission was to enhance the global competitiveness of U.S. business and the U.S. quality of life (the latter including health and safety concerns and non-business interests). Ms. Schweiker discussed ANSI's value in three primary areas: as a policy forum, as an accreditor, and as a source of information. Ms. Schweiker discussed ANSI's composition as being a federation, *i.e.*, an umbrella or organization of companies, government agencies, trade associations, professional and technical societies, labor interests, and consumer organizations, and gave some examples of these entities. She said ANSI's Web site is <ANSI.org> and discussed ANSI requirements for ANSI accreditation (stressing the need for openness, due process, and an appeal process). She also expressed her willingness to act as intermediary in assisting the NCC, and said that four individuals from their respective organizations were with her at the meeting (naming in particular, **Ed Ornelas** of the Telecommunications Industry Association) for NCC members to discuss any matters.

Ms. Wallman noted ANSI's petition for reconsideration filed in the FCC's Public Safety R&O and for Ms. Schweiker's pointing out various other standards organizations that could be used by the NCC.

Questions directed to Ms. Schweiker were from an unidentified individual and **Paul May** of Ericsson. These matters, collectively, pertained to differences, if any, between ANSI NST (National Standards) versus ANSI standards; and licensing and IPO considerations in relation to voluntary and mandatory standards. Ms. Schweiker addressed these matters.

- Ms. Wallman inquired whether the Subcommittees wished to use the remainder of the allotted time for Subcommittee work, and the consensus was that the

Subcommittees did not because one Chair had left and others had to catch flights. Ms. Wallman stated that specifics regarding the November 18th and 19th meeting dates in New York City would be posted on the NCC Web site.

- Dave Buchanan asked whether any agencies currently were trunking the NPSPAC 5 channels. There was no indication from the audience that such was occurring.
- Ms. Wallman adjourned the meeting at 3:00 p.m.

Prepared by: Bert Weintraub
Attorney Advisor
Public Safety & Private Wireless Division
Wireless Telecommunications Bureau
Federal Communications Commission

Certified as to accuracy:

/s/
Kathleen Wallman

Date: 7/15/99